THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—MARCH, 1903.—NO. 3

THE PRIESTHOOD.

IN a recent Apostolic Letter[1] addressed to the Clergy of Italy our Holy Father, Leo XIII, recalls to mind the grave duties that devolve upon the priesthood of our times to combat by example of life and by preaching and writing the errors of the age. The venerable Pontiff points out the moral and intellectual resources at the command of priests, and bids them remember and employ the magnificent prerogative of their position for the defence of truth. Under these circumstances it is especially opportune to reflect upon the singular dignity of the sacred ministry which confers both authority and grace.

"Open the eyes of the intellect," said our Lord to St. Catherine of Siena in one of her revelations, "and gaze at the Sun of Justice, and thou wilt see those glorious ministers, who through ministering the Sun, have become like to it, as I told you of Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. I say the same of these others who have administered in the garden of the holy Church the Light, that is to say, the Body and Blood of My only-begotten Son, who is Himself the undivided Sun, and all the Sacraments of Holy Church which all give life in virtue of the Blood. . . See then that these have taken on them the condition of the Sun, for, having clothed themselves and filled the power of their souls with Me, the true Sun, they become like to Me. The Sun illuminates them and causes the earth of their souls to germinate with its heat. Thus act My own ministers elected and anointed and placed in the mystical body of Holy Church in

[1] The Letter is written in Italian and dated December 8, 1902. A translation of it will be found in another part of this number.

order to administer the Sun, that is to say the Body and Blood of My only-begotten Son, together with the other Sacraments, which draw life from this Blood; this they do in two ways—actually, in administering the Sacraments, and spiritually by shedding forth in the mystical body of Holy Church the light of supernatural science, together with the color of an honorable and holy life, following the doctrine of My truth . . . *So thou seest that they are the Sun, because they have taken the condition of the Sun from Me, the true Sun; because through the affection of love they are one thing with Me, and I with them, and each has given light in the Holy Church according to the position to which I have elected him.*" [2]

In these words the great mystic, with the insight which characterizes such saints, declares the central idea of the Christian priesthood. We are familiar with the oft-repeated objection of the Reformers to sacerdotalism, that it involves an intrusion between God and man; but the very essence of the office in the New Testament is contained in its identity, actual and complete, with the office of Him who is a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedeck. It is not an addition to the priesthood of Christ, a new mediatorship, but the means "whereby He is able also to save forever them that come to God by Him: always living to make intercession for us." "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you," are His own words to His Apostles. It is the Catholic teaching that the priestly office is contained in the Apostolate. It is true that in the earliest ages of the Church a certain delegation or devolution of definite duties to an inferior class of ministers took place, who became known in time by the distinctive name of priests; but this new order, thus created, did not lose its Apostolic character, but retained in common with the superior order of the episcopate, the more precious and spiritual gifts of the Apostolic Order. And these gifts are precisely those which emphasize the mission of our Lord to the individual soul. In the great multitude of priests, then, the office is shorn of its universal character. The "solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" is by the same ordinance rendered incapable of transmitting to others the same powers, but by that very means confined more closely to the great work of the

[2] Dialogue of St. Catherine, translated by Algar Thorold, pp. 251–3.

salvation of souls. This is the work of Christ, and this is the work in which is centred the whole idea of the Christian priesthood.

"It appertains to the office of the priest," says the *Pontificale Romanum*, in the office of Ordination, "to offer sacrifice, to bless, to preach, to baptize." These powers set up a twofold relation in the possessor; on the one side he is brought into contact with the real body of Christ in Holy Mass, the Sacrifice of the New Law, and on the other with the mystical body of Christ, His Church, in the administration of the Sacraments and the ministry of the Word. This twofold relation determines the position of the priest both to God and the people. He kisses the altar, which is the figure of Christ, the Victim of propitiation, turns round to the people and says "*Dominus vobiscum.*" But he does not stand midway between God and the people, as if in his own person he were mediating, but he is drawn into and identified with Christ, the only Mediator. In his relation to the real body of our Lord, he, while changing bread into the flesh of Christ, is himself changed into Him, and then he, one with Christ, has to change the people into Christ. "My little children," said St. Paul to the Galatians, "of whom I am in labor until Christ be formed in you."

In Baptism we are incorporated in the Church, and the character which is imprinted on the soul is not merely a seal, setting it apart, and consecrating it to God's service, but is an active principle, the living root which will put forth branches to bear fruit, or rather it is the ingrafting into the one root which is Christ, in order that the branches may bear fruit. In ordination the priest is made one with Christ, and the sacerdotal character is the communication of the power of Christ by which the recipient is able to work divine things. Through the baptismal character the baptized are put in the position to receive further gifts, but through the priestly character the power of Christ is able to work the communication of His gifts to others. In both cases we have an incorporation with our Lord, but in the first the relation arising is passive, in the other it is active. But it is to be noticed that the powers thus imparted are not ends in themselves, but means to participation in the inner mystic life of the body of Christ.

All life and growth consist in change until the corruptible

shall put on incorruption and the mortal immortality; and the life of the Church is no exception to the rule. Her growth is "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ . . . from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity." (Eph. 4.) This inner life, which thus runs through the mystical body, is the life of grace and charity. It is fed by the Blood of Christ, in whom, to adopt the Apostle's interchange of figure, all the building being framed together, *groweth* up into a holy temple in the Lord. (Eph. 2.) Now the great powers of the sacerdotal character are just those which have the closest connection with this life and growth of the Church. Primarily this connection of the priest with the Church is instrumental; that is to say, so far as direct action is concerned, he can only give rise to this life and feed its growth by means of the Sacraments, where the part he plays is instrumental in the strictest acceptation of the term. Being a free agent he can, it is evident, administer the Sacraments or not at pleasure, but the influx of grace, of life, through them is not under his control to increase or diminish as he may think fit. He is tongue and hand of Christ, who uses these instruments to work the wonders of His grace in the souls of the faithful. Thus he is made one with the scource of all power in the spiritual order, with the Author of that life which has its centre in the Sacred Heart, and thence flows and pulsates through all the members of the mystical body. Thus the priest's professional aim becomes identical with the aim of our Lord, his motive is the same, his work is the work of Him who prayed for priests, saying: "Sanctify them in truth. Thy word is truth. As Thou hast sent me into the world, I also have sent them into the world, and for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth . . . And the glory which Thou hast given to me, I also give to them." (John 17.) The great reality then which is implied in the Christian priesthood is this absorption into and identification with our Lord, so that we

can say of the priest what was said of our Lord, "that he loved the Church and delivered himself for it that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the leaven of water in the word of life, that he might present to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. 5.) This is the great sacrament or mystery of the priesthood of the New Law.

This identification of the priesthood with that of Christ makes the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews stand out in a new light. The contrast between the Jewish sacrifices, with their multitudinous rites, and the one Sacrifice of the Christian dispensation, which is so plainly declared in that Epistle, is seen to require the prolongation of that priesthood by means of the imposition of hands. Every well-instructed Catholic knows that the words which the priest uses, the actions which he performs, are not his own but our Lord's. But non-Catholics too often fail to grasp this truth, and even Catholics, perhaps from over-familiarity, do not sufficiently penetrate its inner meaning. Not only is our priesthood one with the priesthood of Christ, not only is our office His office, but the life which it creates and nurtures is His life. It is that life of grace which will in the end become quickened and glorified into the one single life that, springing out of the eternal life of the Trinity in Unity, will make all things one in God. "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17.) We can indeed only just touch the fringes of the mystery of the supernatural life of grace, but we know that it exists, we know the change which it works in the soul, and we know that the priest is associated with our Lord in the production and fostering of this life. It is the inner bond of unity which is manifested externally in the coördination of all under the visible headship of Peter. Just as the family is bound together by the tie of common blood, so the mystical body of Christ is "compacted and fitly joined together" by the one life of sanctifying grace. Nay, more than this; just as the human body with its many members is animated by the one soul—the source of its energy, and the reason of its unity—so this body of Christ, though of many members, is yet animated and energized by the one life which is found in absolute plenitude in the head, Christ our Lord, alone.

By the exigencies indeed of our composite nature those members who want the fulness of life last on in the visible body of the Church until they either submit themselves again to the vivifying influx of grace, or, when the reaper comes at harvest, are separated as cockle from the wheat and cast into the fire to burn. But those who in the fullest sense are members of the body of Christ, live by that identical life of grace which overflows from the fulness of the grace of Him of whose plenitude we have all received. "Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the *apostles* and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. 2.) Through the apostolic priesthood it is that the body of Christ grows and gathers new members and the kingdom of God gains new citizens. It is the one reason for its existence that the inexhaustible treasures of the grace of God should be poured forth more and more abundantly.

The formation of Christ in the souls of men is therefore *the* work of the priest. In this he is the instrument of our Lord. The power which he uses, through which he acts, is not his own, but divine. It is, however, observable that the efficiency of what he does is much increased by the *conscious* subordination of his mind and will to the mind and will of Him in whose name he acts. It was St. Paul who said: "Such confidence we have through Christ toward God; not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves as ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God, who also hath made us fit ministers of the New Testament, not in the letter but in the spirit." (2 Cor. 3.) It must of course never be forgotten that the sanctity of the priest is not an essential or necessary part of the efficacious administration of the Sacraments; but looking at his work as a whole it is an undoubted fact that in proportion as the priest, who has been incorporated into our Lord by his sacerdotal character, is more and more united to Him by the spiritual union of grace, so does his mission become more and more productive of result. It is quite easy to dissociate sanctity and the priestly office, because they are separable, but very disastrous, because nothing so tends to render sterile the work of a priest as this separation.

The apostolic character then is inherent in the priesthood. He who receives it becomes thereby charged with a mission, to represent Christ before the world, and what is more to reproduce Christ in the world. We may use in this sense the words of the great Apostle: "I live; now not I, but Christ liveth in me." He partakes of the Messianic office; he is aggregated in a measure to the headship of Christ; he receives a commission to sit by His side and that of His first Apostles, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. It is therefore evident that the ideal of the priesthood must necessarily be contained in the closest union with Him who Himself said, "And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as we also are one; I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17.)

It would perhaps be out of place to dwell further on this point, but it will not be inopportune to point out how in this matter the sacerdotal character is not to be distinguished from the baptismal character. A few words will suffice to make the parallel between them clear. In the case of Baptism there are infused into the soul principles which possess indefinite possibilities of expansion and growth towards a perfect realization of Christian holiness. In the case of Ordination there is imparted to the soul a share of the powers of the apostolate which carries with it the intrinsic power of building up a more and more perfect reproduction of the active sanctity of our Lord who was sanctified in truth. (John 17: 19.) If the eyes of faith can trace the outlines of all Christian virtues in the newly-baptized child, so can they trace in the newly-ordained priest the lineaments of those virtues which go to form the equipment of the ambassadors of Christ. According to the teaching of St. Thomas (3a. q. lxiii, *passim*) the sacramental character is a spiritual power, a participation in a greater or less degree according to the sacrament received of the priesthood of Christ; and this indelible spiritual power works continually, where impediments are not placed in its way, to the full realization of its end, which is to be conformed to Him who is the brightness of the glory of God, and the figure (*i. e.*, χαρακτὴρ) of his substance. (Heb. 1: 3.)

The Church, the body of Christ, is not only the recipient and

custodian of divine revelation, but it is, especially through the *charismata* of truth and sanctity, an objective showing forth of the beauty of that revelation. In our Lord the eternal beauty of God standeth, to use the words of the Canticle of Canticles, behind the wall of our humanity, looking through the windows, looking through the lattices; in His mystical body, the same beauty, communicated to it through Him, shines forth ever more clearly. "We all," says St. Paul, "beholding the glory of the Lord with open face are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. 3.) We read that when Moses came down from the Mount, his face shone from the conversation of God, so that he was obliged to put a veil on his face when he spoke to the people. The priest comes from God to the people; and his face should shine from the conversation of God. But in the new dispensation which is in spirit and in truth, it is not necessary to cover the face with a veil, for God has come face to face with His people in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the priest, the *alter Christus*, represents to the people Him who veiled the exceeding brightness of His divinity by humanity, and in veiling revealed it the more manifestly.

FRANCIS T. LLOYD, D.D.

Oscott College, Birmingham, England.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.

III.

I HAVE said that Irenæus is our greatest witness to the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. The disciple of Polycarp, he is but one step removed from St. John the Evangelist; hailing from Asia Minor, Bishop in Gaul, he is the connecting link between the East and the West. Before citing his testimony, however, and that of Tertullian, some notice must be taken of Harnack's singular opinion, alluded to in a footnote to the last article. This view of the Rule of Truth cited by Irenæus is part of Harnack's general theory regarding the origin of the Symbol, and cannot profitably, or indeed at all, be dealt with apart from it.

Also, we must take account of the methods and mental equipment of the man.

Harnack has said his last, or rather his latest, word on the origin of the Symbol in an article written for the third edition of Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, which has been translated into English and brought out in book-form by the Rev. Stewart Means.[1] Splendidly equipped, as this distinguished German writer is, in respect of mental gifts and scholarship, he yet lacks some qualifications that are simply indispensable to the one who would trace the origin of the Symbol. He lacks the gift of Faith, to begin with; he lacks the conception of the Church of Christ as one in all nations—One Fold in which there is one Faith and one Baptism; and he lacks the knowledge, or, at any rate, the realization of the fact that the Symbol was not first given in writing, nor handed down from one generation to another in writing, nor suffered to be put at all in writing until the Discipline of the Secret began to be relaxed. As a consequence of these deficiencies, there are some things that Harnack does not see at all; and, in the case of the things that he does see, he not infrequently magnifies what is trifling in itself, and makes little of, or ignores, what is important. Groping in the dim light of those early ages, he reminds one of the blind man in the Gospel whose sight was being given back to him, and who at first saw "men as trees walking." In short, Harnack lacks the clearer insight which Faith gives, and he lacks the sense of perspective which would enable him to see things in their true proportions.

Let me give a few instances in point from the little book before me. At page 4, Harnack says: "Indeed, the Eastern Church has at no time traced any creed to an Apostolic origin." This is a case of ignoring positive testimony. The Fathers of the Eastern Church will be cited later on in rebuttal. At page 27, he draws attention to the position of "remissionem peccatorum, resurrectionem carnis et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam" in the Creed of the Carthaginian Church. Here, being dim of vision, he mistakes the baptismal interrogatory for the Symbol. The heretics, says St. Cyprian, from whom the words

[1] *The Apostles' Creed*, by Adolf Harnack. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1901.

are taken, "lie in the interrogatory when they say, 'Dost thou believe in the remission of sins . . . through the Holy Church?' since they have not the Church."[2]

At page 17 we read: "I cannot, however, convince myself that twelve divisions [of the Creed] were originally intended. No one who wanted to construct a creed with twelve articles in three main divisions would be so clumsy as to divide into 1 + 7 + 4, or rather 2 + 6 + 4." It is pretty safe to say that twelve divisions were not directly intended; but indirectly or incidentally, they were. In building the fabric of their Creed on the lines of the Trinitarian Formula laid down for them by the Master, the Apostles found it needful to use seven explicit words in telling all that was to be told about the Word of the second article, and four more to describe the Spirit of the third, His work, and His gifts to men. The result is that what was originally 1 + 1 + 1 became 1 + 7 + 4. Had they been guided solely by a sense of symmetry, like Harnack, the 1 + 1 + 1 would have issued in tetrads, thus: 4 + 4 + 4. As it is, the Apostolic Symbol, comprising twelve articles, which the German Rationalist, looking at it from an architectural or æsthetical point of view, finds so unsymmetrical, has ever edified and still edifies Faith. And Faith in its fulness has a symmetry of its own. The Author and Finisher of it, too, who is the Architect of this our earthly dwelling, uses Faith as enshrined in the Symbol to build Himself a stately mansion—"a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." It is not symmetry of form but adaptability to a purpose that is looked for in an instrument.

At page 15 we read: "The Greek text [of the Old Roman Creed] must be regarded as the original, for at Rome the Symbol was for a long time used only in Greek. It was not until long after the Greek text was in use that the Latin text was adopted as a parallel form." According to Harnack himself the Symbol was the Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church from the middle of the second century, when he supposes it was drawn up. Now, while large numbers of the converts in Rome even in the days of St. Paul were Greeks, as appears from the last chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans;* and while Greek was largely used by the

[2] *Ep. ad Magnum* (Migne, tom. 3, col. 1144).

lettered among the Christians in the first centuries, as is shown by inscriptions found in the Roman Catacombs; the fact remains that the language of the Roman people was never any other than the Latin,[3] and that many, not to say the greatest number, of the candidates for baptism were unlettered, and spoke no other tongue than the Latin. Therefore the Roman Church must have used the Symbol in Latin from the first. And the Latin form must have existed from the first side by side with the Greek form. Harnack, in this case, ignores the fact that the Symbol was not given from the first, nor transmitted, in writing. And he forgets that the catechetical and confessional use of the Symbol antedates the liturgical.

But is it quite certain that even the Greek text of the Roman Symbol existed before the Latin? that the Roman Symbol, when first committed to writing, was written in Greek? It is not; it is a probable or plausible conjecture; perhaps not even that. The text of the Symbol of Marcellus of Ancyra, which Harnack points to in proof of his statement, can not be accepted as proof, for two reasons. The first is that the original text of the Symbol of Marcellus has not come down to us. That which has come down to us is found in the pages of Epiphanius,[4] who wrote in Greek, and of course would cite the Symbol in Greek. It is more than likely that Marcellus, had he written his Confession of Faith to Pope Julius from Ancyra, would have done so in Greek. But he wrote in Rome, after a stay in that city, as he tells us himself,[5] of one year and three months—quite long enough to enable him to present his Confession of Faith in the language of the Latin Church, if he were so minded. But there is another and more cogent reason why we cannot take the text of this Symbol of Marcellus, which would be the earliest known, as proof that the Greek text of the Roman symbol was the original one. The Symbol of Marcellus is not the Roman Symbol at all. How is this shown? It is shown by the testimony of Marcellus himself, who declares distinctly in his Letter to Julius that he got his Sym-

[3] Cf. *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, Auctoribus R. Cornely, S.J., *et. al.*, (Editio altera), vol. I, p. 382.

[4] *Adv. Haer.*, lib. 3, Haer. 72. (Migne, P. G., tom. 42.)

[5] Migne, P. L., tom. 8, col. 916.

bol from his forefathers in the faith ;[6] hence not in Rome, nor in the West, but in Asia. And the Symbol itself witnesses to the truth of his testimony, for it ends with the words "ζωὴν αἰώνιον," which were not part of the Roman Symbol for many a long day after the time of Marcellus, but are found, in terms or equivalently, in the earliest Eastern Symbols. There still remains the text cited in the *Psalterium Athelstani.* But the MS. of the *Cod. Laudianus*, which embodies the Latin text, is earlier by well-nigh three centuries than that of the so-called Psalter of Æthelstan.[7]

At page 80, Harnack says: "That the Roman Church after the sixth century gradually let itself be separated from and finally robbed of the symbol which it had previously guarded so faithfully, is a striking phenomenon which has not yet had its causes clearly explained." As a matter of fact, the Roman Church never for one day let itself be separated from its Symbol, and never was robbed of it. What, then, happened? This is what happened. From about the beginning of the sixth century and for a period of some three or four hundred years, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed took the place of the Old Roman in the *Traditio* and *Redditio Symboli.* This was owing to the spread of Arianism in the West. But the Roman Creed still remained in use in the baptismal interrogation, in the baptism of infants, as Burn shows at page 233 of the work already referred to, in the recitation of the Divine Office, and in private worship. When the shorter Symbol becomes once more the Baptismal Creed given to catechumens in the Roman Church, it is found to be no longer the Old Roman but the New Roman, or, as some prefer to regard it, the Gallican Symbol, which is identical with the Apostles' Creed of to-day.

If we are to measure Creeds with a tape line ; if we are to distinguish one from another by the lesser or greater number of words they contain, Harnack is, to a certain extent, right. But if the true way to measure Creeds is by their meaning, by the articles of Faith which they embody, then Harnack is wrong, ridiculously wrong. The twelve articles of the Rule of Faith need not be of exactly the same length, like the twelve inches that make up the carpenter's rule. Faith is not reckoned in feet and

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Cf.* Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 199.

inches. The second article of the Nicene Creed contains almost as many words as the twelve articles of the Old Roman Creed.[8] But the Fathers of Nice could have said with truth that the second article as expounded by them was no longer than before. Exposition sets forth more clearly and defines more accurately the meaning of a statement, but does not alter it, nor add one iota to it. The best way to show how lack of perspective has led Harnack astray here is to place side by side the Old Roman Creed and the Apostles' Creed as we have it to-day. The additions to the former, which are in every case but an explicit setting forth of what was implicit, are put in italics.

Old Roman Creed.	Apostles' Creed.
(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty ;	(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty, *Creator of heaven and earth ;*
(2) And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,	(2) And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord,
(3) Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,	(3) *Who was conceived* of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,
(4) Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried ;	(4) *Suffered* under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, *died, and was* buried. *He descended into hell ;*
(5) Rose again the third day from the dead ;	(5) the third day He rose again from the dead ;
(6) Ascended into heaven,	(6) Ascended into heaven,
(7) Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,	(7) Sitteth at the right hand of *God* the Father *Almighty,*
(8) whence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.	(8) whence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.
(9) And in the Holy Ghost,	(9) *I believe* in the Holy Ghost,
(10) the holy Church,	(10) the holy *Catholic* Church, *the communion of saints,*
(11) the remission of sins,	(11) the remission of sins,
(12) the resurrection of the flesh.	(12) the resurrection of the body, *and the life everlasting.*

It may be remarked, in passing, that this division of the Creed into articles, being that of the Old Roman Creed, should be

[8] The Creed contains 57 words, the article 54, by actual count.

regarded as the true one, although it is not the one generally given by theologians. The words added to the first article are clearly implied in "Almighty"; "born" of the third article implies "conceived"; "crucified" of the fourth, "suffered" and "died"; "buried," the descent into "hell," seeing that the soul as well as the body is to be assigned its locus. "God Almighty" of the seventh article serves but to identify the Father at whose right hand Christ sitteth, with the "Father" of the first article. Expounding the tenth article, which affirmed "the holy Church" merely in the African Creed of his day, St. Augustine adds, "Catholic, of course."[9] And elsewhere, in his exposition of this same article, he declares that "Church" is to be understood here, "not only of that which holds its pilgrim way on earth," but also of "that which in heaven ever cleaves to God."[10] The words "communion of saints" have thus been inserted to indicate that the "Church" signifies the Kingdom of God in its widest sense. Finally, the adjunct "life everlasting" defines the true meaning of "the resurrection," which is not a resurrection unto a mortal life, but a resurrection unto a life without end.

All this is very plain and simple to one who sees with the eyes of Faith. But Harnack's eyes were holden; he could not see it. And so, having no rule but the tape line to measure Creeds withal, he has committed himself to the unhistorical and astonishing statement that the Roman Church actually allowed herself to be robbed of her ancient Symbol. He marvels much how she could have done so, and seeks a solution of what is to him a puzzling problem. A Catholic child could easily have solved it for him.

There are other instances of inaccurate, misleading, and false statements in this little work of Harnack's, but the foregoing will be enough to show how unsafe a guide he is in tracing the Symbol to its origin.[11]

[9] *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 10.

[10] *Enchiridion*, c. 56.

[11] There is one statement more, in a footnote at page 11, which must not go unchallenged. In reference to the legend that each of the twelve Apostles contributed an article to the Creed, he observes: "The Roman Catechism has nevertheless retained it." The Roman Catechism has done nothing of the kind. The compilers give as an alternative explanation of the name Symbol having been bestowed, as they

It is now time to say a word about Harnack's own theory of the origin of the Symbol, and to deal with his attempt to prove that the Rule of Truth cited by Irenæus was neither a Baptismal Creed nor identical with Tertullian's Rule of Faith. Briefly, his theory is that the Old Roman Symbol was composed in Rome about the middle of the second century, and that it was not till the early part of the fourth century, when the Churches of the East, as he supposes, first came to know and value the Roman Symbol, that the formation of symbols began in the East. Before that time, the East, he maintains, had indeed an "old, flexible, christological rule," also "ceremonial or polemical formulas of belief in One God the Creater, and His Only Son Christ," but no "established baptismal confession of faith."[12] Now, this theory is simply pulverized by the testimony of Irenæus, if it be but fairly interpreted. Hence Harnack's attempt, by all the plausible arts of which he is master, to turn the edge of this testimony and save his theory from destruction. How does he set about doing this? He starts with the assumption that no fixed baptismal Confession of Faith existed in the East in the time of Irenæus. This he bases on the fact that none but fragmentary formulas, of a flexible character, are to be found in the early Christian writings of the East. Against this we set the words of Irenæus that "the real Church hath one and the same Faith throughout the world,"[13] and that, while the languages of the world differ, the tenor of the

take it, by the Apostles, that it was co nposed (conflata) of the combined sentiments of all (ex variis sententiis quas singuli in unum contulerunt), the other explanation being that it was to be a "tessera" or badge of the Christian Faith. Rufinus uses words which convey the same meaning as those of the Catechism in relating, not simply how the Symbol came by its name, but how it was composed by the Twelve —"in unum conferendo quod sentiebant unusquisque." In fact the compilers of the Catechism are but citing once more the ancient tradition given by Rufinus as to the origin of the Symbol. And they do not commit themselves so definitely as he does to the statement that each of the twelve Apostles had a hand in the composition of it. They simply say that the Apostles "drew out distinctly the most important points of the Christian Faith in the twelve articles of the Creed." And yet Harnack himself, at page 18, tells us that Rufinus "knows nothing about" the legend; "all that he knows is the common composition of the Roman symbol by the Apostles soon after Pentecost and before the separation."

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

[13] *Adv. Haer.*, bk. I, c. II.

Tradition is one and the same."[14] Where Faith is one and Baptism one there is but one Baptismal Creed. Why, then, those varied and fragmentary creeds? "For this reason," says the Anglican Blunt, "the creeds never occur in an unbroken form in the first centuries. They were committed to memory by the faithful, but never to writing, that heresy might not learn to simulate the faith."[15] It would seem that the *Disciplina Arcani* still withholds its secrets from Harnack. Nor does he appear to realize that one and the same formulary may serve now a catechetical or confessional purpose, now a liturgical; be used at one time as a token of membership and communion, at another as a test of orthodoxy. It is this last use of the Symbol of the true Faith that is brought prominently into view in the East during the second, third, and fourth centuries. As new forms of heresy arose, new adaptations of the one and unchangeable Creed of the Church were devised to meet them, and we find St. Hilary bitterly bewailing this multiplication of "faiths" in his day.

Next, this famous German scholar and critic himself constructs a "confessional formula" out of fragments gathered from four or five different sources; and, as he was "enabled to make a similar conjecture in Justin's case, so it is probable that not only in Irenæus' time but also in Justin's" the formula so constructed "existed in the East." Now, this formula, fashioned, be it remembered, out of preëxisting material by Harnack himself, "Irenæus made the foundation of his *κάνων τῆς ἀληθείας*," or Rule of Truth. But it is probable that Irenæus had to incorporate in his Canon, before it reached its final completion, an "historico-christological formula of confession containing the sentences about the birth, suffering under Pontius Pilate," etc., because this latter formula "is perhaps, or even probably, to be distinguished" from the one that was made the foundation of the Rule of Truth.[16]

This bit of scientific guesswork is interesting, if not very instructive. But what does Harnack take Irenæus for? Does he take him for a fool that he should make him try to refute the

[14] *Ibid.*, c. 10.

[15] Blunt's *Theological Dictionary*, edited by the Rev. John Henry Blunt. Art. "Creeds."

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63-64.

heresies of his day by the help of so crazy a piece of furniture as this patched-up formulary? And where is there room for conjecture when Irenæus himself still lives in his works, and is able to speak for himself? It is so far from being true that there is anything in the writings of Irenæus to show "that he is compiling" his Canon "independently out of a large number of fixed confessional formulas of the Church,"[17] that the very reverse is the case. Irenæus never cites this Rule of Truth, never appeals to this Rule of Truth, but as a something objective, a something quite independent both of himself and of those he is addressing, a something that existed in the Church throughout the world from the first, a something that was always and everywhere the same, a something, in fine, that had the authority of Apostolic institution. He declares that the Rule of Truth is bestowed "by Baptism" on every Christian, for Baptism alone gives a right to the Symbol. The description that he gives of it tallies exactly with that which Tertullian gives of the Rule of Faith which the African Church followed. He tells us that the Churches throughout all the world followed this same Rule of Truth,[18] and Tertullian in Africa tells us the same thing. He distinguishes it from "the preaching of the Apostles, and the teaching of the Lord," as "that which is put into our mouths by the Apostles."[19] He testifies that Polycarp "received from the Apostles that one and only truth, which hath been handed on by the Church," and that this "Tradition which" the Apostles "delivered to those whom they entrusted with the Churches" is the "Rule" to which "consent many nations of the barbarians," who receive it "without letters," and who, "if one should tell them of the inventions of the heretics," would "by that old Tradition Apostolic . . . admit not even to a passing glance of the mind any of their monstrous sayings."[20] Lastly, he appeals to the "Tradition" of the Roman Church, "which it hath from the Apostles," "which Tradition proclaims One God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth."[21]

If this Rule of Truth, the same in all the Churches, was bestowed by Baptism, what becomes of Harnack's assumption

[17] *Ib.*
[18] *Adv. Haer.*, bk. 1, c. 10.
[19] *Ib.*, bk. 2, c. 35.
[20] *Ib.*, bk. 3, c. 4.
[21] *Ib.*, c. 3.

that there was no "established baptismal confession of faith" in the East during the second and third centuries? Irenæus himself lived in the East, came from the East, and ought to know better. As for the word "canon," if it does not mean an "established" rule, one would like to know what it does mean. Again, if the "Rule" of Irenæus was an "Old Tradition Apostolic," could it have been also drawn up by himself? Finally, if this Rule existed in Rome, too, and in Africa, what else could it be but the Symbol of the Roman Church and Tertullian's Rule of Faith?

But let us leave Gaul and cross into Africa. Harnack tells us that he has "traced the old Roman symbol to the time of Tertullian."[22] Well, we shall help him to trace it a good bit farther. And Tertullian is the very man who will enable us to do so. Where did Tertullian get his Rule of Faith? That sturdy champion of Christianity does not leave us one instant in doubt as to where he got it. He got it from the Church, the Church got it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God.[23] At any rate this is what he tells us; and we seem to catch a hint of what is passing in his mind from those words in Matthew where our Lord tells His Apostles that "all power is given" Him "in heaven and on earth," and where, in virtue of that power, He bids them go forth to teach and baptize all nations. We understand Tertullian to mean that the Apostles got the Rule of Faith from Christ, in the same sense that they got from Christ the Faith itself and the authority to formulate such points of it as they deemed needful to grave "on the fleshly tablets" of the hearts of those who were first to "believe" before they could be "baptized." If one thing more than another is clear from the writings of Tertullian, it is that there did not dwell in his mind the shadow of a shade of doubt that the Apostles themselves drew up the Rule of Faith. He regards it as "incredible" that they should not "have set forth to all every clause of the Rule in order (omnem ordinem regulae)."[24] He points out how impossible it would be for "so many and so great Churches to stray into the one Faith," and that what is "one among many comes not by hap, but by

[22] *Op. cit.* p. 70.
[23] *De Praescript.*, c. 37 (Migne, tom. 2, col. 50).
[24] *Ib.*, c. 27.

tradition."[25] He declares that "this Rule existed from the beginning of the Gospel, even before the earliest heresies."[26]

But Harnack's own words shall serve to show how Tertullian witnesses to the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. He tells us (p. 70) that it "is this [the Roman] symbol he [Tertullian] means when he writes *de praescr. haer.* 36;" and cites in part the following passage:

"But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church how happy, into which the Apostles poured all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter has a like passion with the Lord; where Paul is crowned with an end like the Baptist's; where the Apostle John, after he is plunged into boiling oil, and has suffered nothing, is banished to an island. Let us see what she learned, what she taught, when she gave the Symbol also to the Churches of Africa. She confesses one God, the Creator of the universe, and Christ Jesus, the Son of God the Creator, born of the Virgin Mary, and the resurrection of the flesh."

It is of these last words that Harnack says: "This is the symbol that he means." Just so. But Tertullian testifies that the Church of Rome got this Symbol from the Apostles, and gave it to the Churches of Africa, *i. e.*, of proconsular Africa and the parts adjacent. This is "what she learned"[27] from Peter and Paul, her first teachers in the Faith, and this is "what she taught, when she admitted the Africans also into fellowship in that Faith by delivering to them its Symbol."[28] Tertullian answers his own question, and he answers it by citing the "tessera" or Symbol of the Faith. The words of the text are, "cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit." This "contesserarit," a word coined by Tertullian himself, wherein to hide his Symbol, seems to have puzzled editors and translators alike. Some of the editors have changed it into "contestatur," which is never found with a dative, which as a present tense would not follow an aorist, and which gives no meaning; others into "contesseratur," which is from the same verb, but not in the proper mood nor tense. The translator

[25] *Ib.*, c. 28.

[26] *Adv. Prax.*, c. 2.

[27] It is not "quae" but "quid," not "what things" but "what thing."

[28] Nothing short of a paraphrase can bring out the full meaning of "*contesserarit.*"

of this passage, in *The Faith of Catholics*, renders it: "Let us see what she hath learned, what taught, what fellowship she hath had with the churches of Africa likewise." But "didicerit" and "docuerit" are aorists, not present perfect tenses, for it was from the Apostles the Roman Church "learned" that Faith which she afterwards "taught" the Churches of Africa. And "cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit" does not yield the meaning "what fellowship, etc.," but rather "when she gave the symbol of fellowship in Christ to the African Churches.[29] Her Apostolic Symbol was the incorrupt germ whence the virgin Mother Church of Rome begot her virgin daughters in Africa also. And, to vary the metaphor, with the varying use of the Symbol, this was the signet ring she placed upon their fingers on the day she clothed them in the white robes of their Baptism—the seal and sure token of their birthright in God, their espousals in Christ, and their fellowship in the one Faith. The word "tessera," from which Tertullian boldly coined the verb "contesserare" (not the first nor yet the last sample of his work in this line), means "symbol," and we all know, or ought to know, that the symbol of fellowship among the early Christians was no other than the Apostolic Symbol. A few chapters back, in the same work, Tertullian uses the expression "contesseratio hospitalitatis" to signify how the Symbol of their common Faith served the early Christians as a token whereby they could recognize and, recognizing, give the right hand of fellowship and hospitality to their pilgrim brethren. The

[29] It would seem that the translator based his rendering on the reading of this passage given by Burn at page 49 of his work. "Videamus, quid didicerit, quid docuerit, quid cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis *contesserauit.*" This I take to be another attempt at mending a text, which stood in need of interpretation, not mending. Of course there should be no comma after "Videamus;" "quid" is the interrogative, and introduces a dependent question. Obviously, then, "contesseravit" is a mistake. There is a parallelism of construction in the "quid" clauses, and one needs not to have studied the classics at Eton or Oxford to know that a dependent question never has its verb in the indicative. But perhaps "contesseravit" is a misprint. The "cum" of this reading is a preposition; the "cum" of Migne's text, a conjunctive adverb; but between the two readings there is no essential difference of meaning. Whether "Africanis ecclesiis," in Migne's, is a dative or an ablative we can only conjecture. The privilege of coining a new verb must carry with it the privilege of saying what case it shall govern—*saeviant quantumvis grammatici.* (The word *contesserauit* given above is so printed in Burn's book. The *u* of the last syllable is old Latin spelling for *v.*)

Symbol was their test of Church membership, by means of which, as the Anglican Blunt well expresses it in the work already cited, "in the first troubled years of the Church, Christians proceeding from one point of the world to another were at once known and received into unreserved communion as brethren in one common Lord."

Readers of the Breviary will remember that in the Office of St. Cecilia we are told how the Saint sent Vespasian for baptism to Pope Urban, and how "signo quod acceperat invenit sanctum Urbanum." What was this "sign" if not the Baptismal Symbol? We may conjecture, also, that when our Blessed Lord likens the Kingdom of Heaven to a woman who takes a little leaven and hides it in three measures of meal, till the whole mass is leavened (Matt. 13: 33; Luke 13: 21), He has the Symbol in His mind's eye. The woman is the Church, and the leaven is the Symbol which she takes and hides away for a space in the multitude of all nations and tribes and tongues, till the whole mass is leavened—till the power of paganism is broken, and the peoples of the earth gather, in the open day, around the standard of the Cross. The Gospel was to be preached from the housetops from the very first. But the Symbol, which was not given openly to men, nor "written with ink on paper, but graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart," was, like the leaven in the meal, secretly doing its work in all the world.[30]

We have next to see what answer can be made to those who say that the tradition of the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol was not only unknown in the East, but that even in the West, St. Augustine, so far from adhering to it, says expressly that the very words which compose the Symbol were taken from the Scripture.

ALEXANDER MACDONALD, D.D.

St. Francis Xavier College,
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

[30] So far as I have been able to see, the only one of the Fathers who notes and lays stress on the use of "hid" in the parable of the leaven is St. Clement of Alexandria, who lived at a time and in a place where the Discipline of the Secret seems to have been observed with more than ordinary strictness. "Now even also by means of the parable of the leaven," he observes, "does our Lord signify the concealment (*τὴν ἐπικρυψιν*), for He says, "*The Kingdom of heaven is like to leaven, which a woman took and hid in three bushels of meal, until the whole was leavened.*" —*Strom.*, l. 5, n. 12.

REPORTS OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSIONS (OF 1899–1900) ON RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL MATTERS.

IT is likely that the historian of the Philippines and its vast sister island groups of Carolines and Marianas will look for sources of information relative to the countless problems of all kinds associated with those three archipelagos to the many works in original, or compiled form now being published by the United States Government. Nor without good reason. Of these official, therefore presumably trustworthy, documents not a few, as is readily acknowledged, are of great aid to scholars, replete as they are with varied data not otherwise easily attainable. Especially helpful are such works as bear on the present material conditions of human life in those islands, on industries, finance, trade, commerce, food supplies, as well as the very many varieties of racial and linguistic character, in the inhabitants thereof, not excluding either the numerous and sometimes very striking singularities in type of the numberless realms of fauna and flora encountered by explorers in that far-away quarter of our eastern domain.

Nor among our Washington treasures should the scholar overlook the many treatises descriptive of the meteorology and topography of those archipelagos, the latter in the form of surveys, charts and atlases, several by European pen and pencil, that have been given to scholardom by American experts.

Admirable treatises of high scientific worth are in the reports, too, of the Philippine Commissioners of 1899 and 1900 (under Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft), in which all we need say here is that (in their four volumes) they present much useful and interesting data in the form of "exhibits," tables, and papers relative to various provinces and pueblos in those islands, along with statistics bearing on ethnology, temperature, physical geography and the like.

But for its worthiness from a scientific standpoint on neat and pretty complete scale, though somewhat unhandy for its bulk, yet none the less authoritative therefore, is a book to be welcomed by statisticians, the voluminous *Pronouncing Gazetteer and Geographic Dictionary of the Philippines* [Washington, 1902], by far and away perhaps as good a representative of its class as is to be had in our American scholastic world.

For therein, besides the usual features of its kind, are much valuable data relating to temperature, the various censuses of the islands, from the earliest in 1735 down, lists of the eighty-four tribal names, and chief dialects in use, catalogues of plants, woods, fruits, minerals, mammals, fishes and birds, then a chronologic table of the principal events in the islands from A. D. 1519 to 1901, with a list of the Governors-general to Diego de los Rios, the last in 1898.[1]

Referring to this *Gazetteer* the writer has observed that the latitude of Manila, given officially (p. 183) as " 14° 35′ 31″ N.," is identically the same as set down in the *Atlas de Filipinas* of Jesuit scientists at Manila, also published by Government [Washington, 1899], a location of that metropolis (be it recalled) that varies only twenty-nine seconds from the latitude determined for it by the Friar geographer of the Augustinians, Villacorta, who published his statistics nearly three-quarters of a century ago.[2]

Yet among these noteworthy honorable works of artistic, scientific and historical tone are several others, which, though fair-looking and scholarly enough, will be found replete with defects of many kinds, against equity, good taste, and ethics, despite their very imposing sponsorship by men, too, of mark in the realms of letters and statecraft.[3]

Such are the reports on Philippine affairs by the two Commissions headed respectively by Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft. They were drawn up in the closing years of the century just closed. Among other subjects treated therein are various pictures of religious, educational and social life in those islands—of churchmen, missionary labors, school-teachers, institutes of industry, orphanages, asylums and the like. They are entitled :

Report of the Philippine Commission [Washington, 1900], in two vols. of 774 pages. (In the second volume is the testimony taken by the Schurman Commission.)

[1] The index to this admirable volume, however, is in a very out-of-the-way place, where one would barely look for it, about the middle of the book itself. (See p. 249.)

[2] A paper on these two atlases (by the present writer) was published in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* last year. (See xiii, 4-21.)

[3] Among the members of the two Philippine Commissions were litterati, lawyers, judges, writers. We name them later.

Reports of the Taft Philippine Commission [Washington, 1901], one volume of 333 pages.

Senate Document, No. 190 [S. l. s. a., but Washington, 1901], one volume of 283 pages. (This contains the testimony taken by the Taft Commission.)[4]

General Observations.

In our observations on these Philippine reports we shall be guided by the following limitations:

1. In our strictures thereon no reflection is meant on the personal character of the nine members of the Commissions, nor on all like. Some of them, perhaps, were fair minded men. Anyhow there is no evidence to the contrary. But, *per contra*, others were positively unfair, as is proved too by their papers on Philippine matters published prior to their appointment as Commissioners. Therein they have set themselves on record as strongly prejudiced against the very defendants they were pledged to try with judicial fairness.

2. Nor are our remarks to be taken as bearing against anything else in their reports than the Commissioners' treatment of such subjects as the Christian religion, Christian churches, Christian education and the Christian life of the natives, with their standards of Christian civilization.

3. We observe also that throughout this paper we style as "defendants" that numerous body of philanthropists in the Philippines and its associated groups,—churchmen, prelates, missionaries, friars, teachers, school officers and others, all dedicated to religion in one way or another, who in these reports have been denounced as guilty of divers crimes,—of un-Christian, nay even unnatural, conduct.

The defendants have been charged with simony, cruelty, rapacity, sensuousness, or, more briefly, with having used their sacred office and title mainly for mere self-gratification—charges given by the Commissioners in detail, in terms however that our pages refuse to reproduce in their original foulness.

As "prosecutors" therefore we name the Commissioners as a

[4] For the sake of brevity these works are referred to respectively as *Schurman*, *Taft*, and *Sen. Doc.*

body, who at the same time filled the part of judges, investigators and attorneys for the prosecution.

Church Statistics in 1898.

To our task, then. But a glance, first,—a kind of bird's-eye view, as it were, of the main agencies lately at work in the civilization and enlightenment of the natives of those islands, where ever since the days of the Christian pioneers of the sixteenth century, their successors (as noticed by chroniclers and travellers, even non-Catholic) have kept to the task as staunch upholders of civilization on Christian lines, of morality, order, law, in that vast region of Malaysia, of countless islands large and small.

In 1898, the year of the downfall of Spanish rule in the three great archipelagos of Philippines, Marianas, and Carolines, there were in service throughout the islands 1642 priests, churchmen of divers ranks, five of them bishops, one the Archbishop of Manila; then clergy of lower degree,—vicars-general, *parrocos*, missionaries, nearly all members of religious orders.

According to Dr. Schurman (whose figures we reproduce here), the clergy of the Philippines numbered about 2383. They were communicated to him (he says) by the Church authorities at Manila; and the figures are no doubt right. But in some cases, at least, they represent the totality of membership in the several orders of churchmen, not only in actual service in the islands, but the members of the various brotherhoods—clerics and laics also at work abroad in houses and colleges of their order in Europe, Asia, and America. Hence the figures given by the Doctor are misleading. Thus, for instance, in his statistics for the Augustinians, who numbered (he says) 644, are included 203 students in Spain, in course of education at colleges of their order at Valladolid and La Vid, in preparation for active mission service in eastern lands, in care of their province, as the Philippines and China. But, as said above, the number of priests in the islands in 1898 was only 1642. Here are the Doctor's figures [i, 133-136]: Augustinians, 644; Benedictines, 14; Capuchins, 36; Dominicans, 528; Franciscans, 475; Jesuits, 164; Lazarists,[5] 35,

[5] Lazarists as commonly known in the U. S. appear in Spanish statistics variously as *Paulos*, *Paulistas*, *de San Vicente de Paulo*. Officially Lazarists are known as members of the *Congregatio Missionum*, whence the letters "C. M." after their names.

of whom 27 only were priests; Recoletos, or discalced, unshod Augustinians, 522. While of native clergymen—"indigenas," there were (according to Judge Taft) [p. 24][6] 150, "in charge of small parishes." All, however, employed, as were their white brothers, in various branches of philanthropic, religious, and educational work.

In the Philippines, it may be stated, were 967 districts with care of souls,—parishes, 746; mission parishes, 105; then *misiones activas* (where heathens were to be converted, as in Mindanao and some parts of Luzon), 116. In all, the Catholic population of the islands for 1897-1898 was 6,559,998 souls.[7]

Here are some census figures regarding church statistics of various denominations in the United States that perhaps may be of interest. They were drawn up by the Rev. Dr. Carroll, non-Catholic, and are as follows:

	Ministers.	Churches.	Communicants.
Methodist (17 bodies)	39,220	56,787	6,084,755
Baptists (13 bodies)	35,564	51,142	4,629,487
Presbyterians (12 bodies)	12,207	15,315	1,635,016

or, on an average, one minister for every 155 Methodists; one for every 130 Baptists; one for every 133 Presbyterians. [From *Literary Digest*, N. Y., for January 31, 1903, p. 158.]

In 1898, in our Malaysian groups of archipelagos with a Catholic population (as said) of 6,559,998 souls, in charge of 1642 missionaries, we thus have on similar average, one Catholic priest for every 3995 natives,—a fact that goes to show very conclusively that Catholic friars by no means were overrunning the Philippines. No, those islands were most assuredly not a "priest-ridden land." The various orders of churchmen (named above), it may be observed, entered missionary service in the Philippines in the following years: Augustinians, in 1565; Franciscans, in 1577; Dominicans and Jesuits, in 1581 (the latter driven from the

[6] From other sources, however, we learn that the number of native priests in the Philippines was 675; while the total regular clergy was only 967, or in all 1642.

[7] The above parish figures and population census are from Judge Taft's Report [p. 23] and they, too, are right.

islands in 1768, returned in 1859); Recoletos, in 1606; Capuchins, in 1886, and Benedictines in 1895.[8]

Besides there was another class of civilizing agencies in those islands, all doing steady and healthful service, bodies by no means to be omitted from our rolls of honor—the various sisterhoods of (women) religious in those archipelagos, as Assumptionists (miswritten "Ascensionists" by Dr. Schurman) [ii, 458], or sisters *de la Asuncion*, under the rule of St. Augustine; Dominicanesses; Franciscans, in number thirty-four—all tertiaries or members of third orders; then Sisters of Charity—gentlewomen trained in the service of God and their neighbor as teachers, guardians of maidenhood, nurses—all devoted to various works of beneficence in school-room, hospital, asylum, *beaterio*, while similarly all were adepts of greater or less skill in the practice of homelike virtues, preëminently peculiar of the feminine world in every Christian commonwealth—contemplation and prayer, otherwise the love of learning, on lofty lines with the love of God—religion—basis of true exalted patriotism. (At this writing the number of these self-sacrificing women-philanthropists in those tropical regions is not known, with the two exceptions above.[9])

Renowned among the islanders were the four great *beaterios*—homes, retreat-houses, as well as boarding-schools, for needy maidens, thence styled *beatas*. They were the following: *de la Compañia de Jesus*, or San Ignacio, founded in 1684, by Ignacia de Espiritu Santo, a pious mestiza of Binondo; St. Catharine of Siena, founded by Dominicans under their provincial, Juan de San Domingo, in 1696, both of Manila origin; San Sebastian of Calumpang, founded in 1719 by four Indian maidens, though seventeen years later, in 1736, put under the direction of Recoletas; then Santa Rita of Cascia, founded at Pasig, in 1740, by the earnest-souled and very energetic *parroco* of that pueblo, Felix de Trillo, Augustinian, under the title of *la Concepcion*.

Then there were orphan asylums. Thus, at Mandaloya, a few

[8] Information as to the date of entrance of the Lazarists is not at hand. According to Dr. Schurman, the Lazarists arrived in 1862. [*Schurman*, i, 135.]

[9] But since these pages were put in print, we learn that the Sisters of Charity in the islands numbered 184, of whom 147 were Spanish, 22 mestizas, 14 Filipinas, and one Portuguese.

miles distant from Manila, where the Augustinians had an asylum for girls, established in 1883, were several Indian sisters—natives—who, with their Spanish sisters of the Asuncion, cared for 122 orphan girls, whom they housed, fed, clothed, and taught. During the late invasion of the islands, these Indian maidens, driven with the others from their home, fled to Manila for shelter. At Mandaloya, the little girls were taught needle-work, embroidery, laundry, ironing, and such other industries as would enable them to gain an honest livelihood.

While at Tambóbong, not far from Manila, was a similar establishment for boys, that previously had been conducted at Malabón, still earlier at Guadalupe, a pueblo in care of Augustinians, where, in 1882, under the title of Our Lady of Consolation, and St. Thomas of Villanova, the Fathers established the first orphanage in Luzon, transferred thither from Mandaloya, now given over to girls. At Tambóbong asylum, 145 little lads (without father or mother) were trained as printers, bookbinders, tailors. In 1898, or soon after, both asylums were destroyed, with their libraries, museums, machinery, and all.

In care then of those guardians of Christian society, of its shrines, homes of learning and industry, throughout the various islands, were many institutions that make for the higher life of mankind—establishments of religion, education, public beneficence, some of them dating from the first years of the re-discovery of the Philippines under Legazpi and his companion, the Friar cosmographer and sailor, Urdaneta, of the Augustinians.

Thus in 1897–1898, as we learn from official statistics, in the Philippines and its sister groups, were the following institutions of the higher life: university, one; colleges (number not known); seminaries for cleric training, five; orphanages, two; hospitals, ten; pueblo, or common schools, for Indians, 2140; *beaterios*, or homes for maidens, four; besides many societies or guilds of religious and beneficial character attached to the several churches in cities and pueblos, known variously as confraternities, sodalities—*hermandades*. Named in Philippine statistics we find the following: *hermandad de la Misericordia*, that as early as 1596 established the hospital of San Juan de Dios, though a still earlier asylum for the sick—San Lazaro, had been opened in 1578, by

the Franciscan lay brother Juan Clemente; then the Recoleto confraternity of Jesus Nazareno, founded in 1651; the confraternities of the Most Holy Sacrament at Manila Cathedral church in 1604, and a similar guild at Binondo in 1681; while from the first years of their entrance into Philippine fields Augustinian and Dominican had erected branch fraternities of their order in well nigh every mission-town. In 1571, Cebú witnessed the formation of the first confraternity in the islands—*Nuestra Señora de la Correa*, or Our Lady of the Girdle, by pioneer Augustinians; Manila, the second shortly after.

In his "Exhibit" [No. vi]—a valuable and very interesting display of "Public Instruction . . . during Spanish Sovereignty" in those islands, Dr. Schurman, though naming the greater number of these establishments of high rank, of religious and social eminence, still has omitted some, as will be noticed. [*Schurman*, ii, 456–476.[10]]

Charges Against the Reports.

In our analysis of these reports we purpose to show that in framing them the Commissioners, contrary to the canons of judicial as well as historic equity, were in fault also on many points of vital importance to the defendants.

1. Because of numerous omissions in the evidence accepted, however, by the Commissioners as conclusive—evidence, moreover, that bore strongly in favor of the defence, on such points as (*a*) the primal and contemporary state of civilization and refinement in the Philippines; (*b*) the present fairly high character of the natives for intellectual and moral virtuousness; (*c*) the work of the Church in uplifting the Philippines and other Malaysian island-groups to a lofty plane of domestic and social welfare, (*d*) with school facilities and good results therefrom in even far distant islands of those great archipelagos.

Again, in these reports you will find little or no mention, except maybe in some out-of-the-way place, of the innumerable

[10] In this respect the Taft report is meagre, in fact very deficient, the Judge (unless we mistake) mentioning only San José College at Manila, that had been opened in 1601, by the Jesuit visitor of their missions—Luis Gomez. [*Sen. Doc.*, 26–46.]

monuments of intellective and material art, as shrines, church-buildings, *conventos*, libraries, cabinets of physics, of natural history, many of them centuries old, with no others like them in Eastern or Asiatic lands, all in charge of scholarly and enthusiastic men and women devoted to lofty planes of thought,—all tokens of high-grade civilization, to be discerned (let it be marked very plainly) only in countries and lands of thorough Christian ideals. As a most striking, though very gloomy, contrast to this picture here with deep pity we need but a glance at the semi-barbaric islands in Malaysia not under Christian influence or sway—the Sulu, or Jolo group, then Borneo, Java, where the natives, under the fetters of Mammon, are, as it were, little else than savages, or bondsmen to grasping money-making European taskmasters and traders.

The omission in these reports of the above-named material proofs of intellective worth among the Philippines is to be emphasized very strongly. Throughout their papers (we must add), the Commissioners seem to have been lacking in appreciative, if not even friendly, spirit also; to have displayed throughout an unkindly tone with reference to all Christian concerns, while sparing (as will appear) no space for the embalmment therein of whatever could be raked together derogatory in any way to the manifold grandeur of Christian æstheticism in the East.

2. Because evidence, which was not lacking to the defence, if admitted at all, was accepted in grudging, unhandsome spirit, as it were. Thus, while in the Schurman report, as observed, some of these model art-works have been named, in his successor's only one has been mentioned. (See above.)

3. Moreover, the prosecution has admitted as final and conclusive, without the slightest substantiation—proof of any kind, whatever testimony, even of the flimsiest, could be twisted and stretched, to the discredit of the defendants.

4. In many of their allusions to Philippine life, ideals, customs, people, missionaries, institutions, and the like, Christianity, that is, the Catholic religion, if referred to at all, is with depreciating tone. Here are some samples. In touching on school matters, Dr. Schurman declares it a faulty practice, a

"mistaken idea of putting instruction in Christian doctrine before reading and writing." [*Schurman*, ii, 457.]

Judge Taft, too, finds occasion for censure, in that

"in the typical provincial school at first a kind of religious primer was read in the native language, and that later a book on Christian doctrine was taught." [*Taft*, 106.]

Indeed. So it's wrong, then, to teach young children their religion? Yet, if we mistake not, and as we stoutly believe, it is still healthy common practice in all well brought up Christian home-circles to teach a child the principles of good behavior at its mother's knee, long too before it has entered, or even dreamed of, the very entangling mysteries of A-B-C books, or pot-hooks. Why then in the Philippines should similar ethical usage be deemed out of place?

Judge Taft, moreover, fairly revels, it seems, in his fancy for flaw-picking at the slightest chance in any matters that may be interpreted to the disfavor of churchmen. Just here one instance merely. In his report, where engaged in building up a case against the defendants, in order apparently to score a point to their discomfort, he has taken their testimony to pieces, instead of giving it in full; then quotes some fragments, which apparently put the defendants in the wrong. Thus to a consideration of the testimony of the provincial of the Franciscans the Judge allots a little over a page [*Taft*, 25, 26]; to the Augustinian provincial less than two lines [*Id.*, 26, 27], and to the Bishop of Jaro less than ten [*Id.*, 29], or at most in all a very meagre two pages, though elsewhere these very defendants have been styled by the Judge as men of high rank. Though printed in a wholly different work, one may find in full the testimony of these three churchmen [*Sen. Doc.*, 63–71, for Villegas of the Franciscans; 71–80, for Lobo, of the Augustinians; 112–122, for the bishop]—a book, however, as may be noticed, of wholly different title, one moreover, that the reader of the Judge's report will not likely know anything about until maybe long after his mutilations have wrought their effect in the reader's mind. (Later we will give other samples of the Judge's expertness in word-twisting.)

Again Judge Taft is more than once in conflict with his own words. Thus, to churchmen in the Philippines he pays a rather neat eulogy by saying that

"the friar . . . was usually the only man of intelligence and education." [*Taft*, 24.]

Again that

"There were, of course, many educated gentlemen of high moral standards among the friars. The bishops and provincials who testified were all of this class." [*Id.*, 28.]

While *per contra* of the natives he declares that

". . . the masses of the people are ignorant, credulous and childlike" [*Id.*, 15], an "ignorant people." [*Id.*, 32.]

Yet all of a sudden when treating of the charges brought by these self-same "ignorant" and "credulous" prosecutors against their old-time missionaries and friends—"gentlemen (*too*) of high moral standards,"—the Judge with a rather unaccountable face-about movement would have us not believe these defendants. That is, to use his own words,

"the charges (*against churchmen*) have considerable truth in them" [*Id.*, 29]; ". . . the statements of the bishops and friars . . . cannot be accepted as accurate." [*Id.*, 30.]

In fact, in these kaleidoscope-looking reports, so commonly in them are admissions in favor of the defendants matched with denouncements of everything churchly, that, according wholly to his own proper frame of spirit, be this friendly or adverse to churchman, the reader may be warranted in drawing pretty much any kind of conclusion he is seeking,—a seeming abnormality however of unscholarly psychology, exemplified in the reports of the very Commissioners themselves, who, though arguing seemingly from self-same premises (the evidence in their reports being practically identical), yet reach conclusions diametrically opposite.

Thus, in describing the high grade of refinement among the Philippines, Dr. Schurman styles them as "civilized." [*Schurman*, 12.]

"A majority of the inhabitants . . . (*he says are*) possessed of a considerable degree of civilization." [*Id.*, 16.]

There are

"provinces . . . whose people are most highly civilized." [*Id.*, 18.]

But, according to the Judge, these very same people are "ignorant," etc. [See quotations ahead.]

Again, according to the Doctor,

"the normal school, conducted by the Jesuits, at Manila, . . . has done good work in training teachers, etc. [*Schurman*, i, 34.]

The Judge, however, with no exception, would have us believe (in his section on "Education under Spanish rule") that

"native teachers (*are*) tediously mechanical, noisy, and hardly effective, or economical." [*Taft*, 105, 106.]

That is to say, in these reports where now and then one Commissioner hails a gleam of sunshine in the intellectual firmament of the Philippines, the other at no time seems to descry aught but hopeless chaos and gloom. The Doctor styles the Philippines enlightened; the Judge, barbaric. Or, more briefly, to sum up these few vari-colored illustrations of judicial conflicts relating to the religious, ethical, and social characteristics of those islanders (of which the reader will meet several others before ending these pages), the deductions in matters, too, of very weighty moment drawn by the Commissioners (they say) from the testimony of their own witnesses, will be found in conflict with it. At the same time, too, the reader will notice that the Commissioners themselves are in open conflict with one another.

We need here make a reflection that we have long been pondering over, in view of the almost absolute unqualified condemnation (in these reports) of the whole past in the Philippines, of all systems of rule, of ethics, piety, faith, law, good works, in brief, of the grandeurs of our Christian Malaysia—glories that yet have been attested with enthusiastic praise by numberless travellers, scholars, explorers, even non-Catholic. Was there then (in 1899–1900) at Manila in and around these two courts of our Commissioners some mysterious, occult, (maybe even) mischief-making power at work to set at odds with one another all concerned in those courts of inquiry and trial—judges, witnesses, prosecutors?—to mislead them in defiance even of their own philosophic—nobler—instincts of the evidence of their own eyes and ears? And did this malign genius (as at times seems to have happened in America and Europe, why then not in Asia?) not try its hardest with the aid of cable and printing-press to blot out from the inhabitants of the Philippines all respect for their one-

time happy and prosperous sacred and civil estate, to overturn in their souls every mark of regard and love for the Christian faith, for Christian law, for Christian policy? (Of similar evil influences against our schools, altars, and homes, here, and in Europe, we have read before.) But let this go as a mere reflection.

Genesis of the Reports.

So much then for a mere bird's-eye view, as it were, of our field of instruction, and scholastic entertainment in these four volumes of Manila reports,—a general perspective of the work done in those high assemblies in the Philippines.

Now for our analysis of these reports in detail. And first as to the genesis of the courts themselves, that in their legislative and judicial pomp and grandeur, in their sittings at Manila in the closing years of the century just passed, gave Malaysia a forecast of the new rule and the new order of things.

The first Commission (under Dr. Schurman) (it may be premised) began its hearings in the early summer of 1899, less than a year after the downfall of Spain in the East. [*Schurman*, i, 1.]

At this time, we may observe, outside of Spain knowledge of the Philippines was meagre enough. As shown in our encyclopedias, histories, and atlases, those islands were practically a *terra incognita* of common reputation only for hemp and cigars.

Members of this Commission were: Jacob Gould Schurman, LL.D.; Major General Elwell S. Otis, of the U. S. Army; Rear Admiral George Dewey, of the U. S. Navy; Charles Denby, LL.D., lawyer, diplomat, formerly Minister to China; Dean Conant Worcester, professor of zoology and botany; while John R. McArthur was appointed Secretary and Counsel of the Commission, and Rutherford Corbin, Assistant Secretary. [*Schurman*, i, 1.]

This Commission was charged to investigate the conditions of life in those Asiatic archipelagos, to suggest solutions of problems bearing on "order, peace and public welfare," while it was instructed, moreover, to observe due regard for "all ideals, customs and institutions" of the inhabitants,[11]—all problems, it may be

[11] "Tribes," however, is the word used by President McKinley in his letter of instructions to the first Commission, for which see *Schurman*, i, 186.

added, that so far in the history of philosophic and political speculations have taxed gravely the wisdom of even the sagest geniuses among men.

It is matter for deep reflection that our own non-white fellow inhabitants in the United States—blacks, mulattos, Indians, as well as people of other colors, are not yet on the same social, if not also political, standing with whites.

The second Commission (under Judge Taft) opened its sessions

"in July (1900) and continued from time to time until late in October"

of the same year, having begun

"its legislative and executive duties under the instructions of the President"

on the first of September previous. [*Taft*, 16, 19.] Members of this commission were William H. Taft, Dean C. Worcester, Luke E. Wright, Henry C. Ide, Bernard Moses, Ph.D., professor of history and political economy. [*Taft*, 15.] As to the other officers of this Commission, and the reasons for the dissolution of its predecessor, positive information is lacking. It would appear, however, that the Schurman Commission, whose report in a way is rather favorable to the defendants, was withal somewhat too manly, of too independent frame, to suit the schemes of interested parties in the political and commercial world in the United States, especially that had an eye mainly on the mere material possibilities in the Philippines. (The race of "boomers" of various kinds was not yet extinct.) So much, then, for the personnel of the two Commissions.

Mode of Procedure in the Commissions.

Now for a panorama of their acts, during the years 1899–1900. From details gleaned here and there in their reports as to the mode of procedure employed in assembly—a very important feature for the student in order to discern the significance of their moves in this stupendous drama of politics—we learn that

"in preparing their several papers the members of the Commission (the first) . . . derived data not only from Spanish books and

documents, . . . but also from evidence taken from witnesses," . . . [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]

These witnesses, as we learn elsewhere in the Doctor's report, were 46, their names appearing in the index at the end of the second volume [ii, 477–486]; and among them, as far as we can make out, were only three churchmen, of whom more later on.

The names of the witnesses before the second Commission (under Judge Taft) number 38, to be found with their testimony *in extenso* in *Sen. Doc.*, 47–283. Eleven of them were churchmen, two of whom had already testified before Dr. Schurman. Thus, of the 84 witnesses before the two Commissions, twelve only were for the defence, in fact were defendants themselves.

The reader is not to overlook this plain matter of fact, that the clergy in the Philippines and its sister archipelagos, hundreds and hundreds in number, were in control, not only of many institutions of learning, art-work, science; of colleges, seminaries, pueblo schools, established throughout those islands, but besides were entrusted as so many bulwarks of order, peace, and law, with certain government functions in nearly all the provinces, especially where Indians were the sole population. Here in a general way the missionaries were the instructors, guides, caretakers of the Philippine commonwealth in spiritual and temporal concerns. For these duties the friars had received especial training in their colleges in Europe. They were expert in the management of Indians. While also, it may be noted, such blending of the two fields of Church and civil authority and power in the Philippines in one and the same individual, who, at the same time, was the minister of religion, as well as the main person of prominence or standing among the natives themselves, is frequently described in these reports [*Taft*, 25, 26], though never in commendatory terms. In our Government schools for Indians "out West," similar union of Church and State in the person of one and the same incumbent, whether mere trader, politician, money-maker, or even minister of God, has been exemplified often. (But this, however fruitful in reflections, is a digression.) As to the Doctor's valuation of topics of such magnitude, we return to his reports. There we find a paper of but 7½ pages in length at the furthest, devoted to clergy [*Schurman*, i, 130–

136]; to education, another paper of 25 pages [*Id.*, i, 17–42]; and a third, on "Public Instruction in the Philippines during the time of Spanish Sovereignty," otherwise "Exhibit VI," of 20 pages [*Id.*, ii, 456–476]. That is, of the 775 pages of his reports, only 52½, not as much as 7 per cent., have been devoted to the main civilizing agencies at work in the Philippines in their various fields of peace, wherein the prosperity and happiness of about 7,000,000 souls were concerned—a somewhat meagre allowance of literature (it may be remarked) on the main subject of all—a species of literary vacuity that would indicate, it seems, somewhat of a lack of proportion with the balance of the Doctor's report.

But to continue with our Schurman sessions, wherein we are told that

> "the witnesses came in freely, . . . from all classes of the people, and they represented all varieties of opinion." [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]

A picturesque description, this, of admirable fairness in appearance—a bit of rhetorical fancy, however, of "putting the thing which is not for the thing which is," that (as far as the reports themselves go) is without but a very faint scintilla of truth.

At the very most, of Dr. Schurman's 46 witnesses, three churchmen only appeared, merely however as teachers; they were questioned by the Commission merely on educational subjects. They were the Dominican rector of the University of Manila, Father Santiago Paya, and two Jesuits, Fathers Miguel Saderra, of the Ateneo, and Pedro Torra, of the Normal School [*Schurman*, ii, 242, 278]. While, so far as we can judge, all the other witnesses, 43 in number, were for the prosecution, nearly all out of sympathy for the defendants, where they were not professedly in open antagonism to them.

The "varieties of opinion" besides that the Doctor refers to, seem from the reports to have been little else than a mass of unclean, harsh and loathsome details regarding Church affairs, and very "Maria-Monkish" in looks,—anti-Catholic, anti-Christian. In this respect about the only difference between the reports of the two Commissioners is that while Dr. Schurman publishes, of course, all his anti-friar testimony (without comment, however), the Judge all through seems to believe it; nay, even goes out of

his way to support it with the prestige of his judicial mantle. Thus, after traversing some very foul charges against Philippine churchmen, he thinks to account for their frailty by saying they came to the islands

"from the peasant class in Andalusia—" [*Taft*, 28.]

an allusion, by the way, to this one-time old Mahometan stronghold in Spain, that, like other neat-looking fancies of rhetoric in these reports, happens to have little or no foundation in fact. After some considerable research into the birthplaces of our Philippine missionaries, we are able to affirm that of all the Spanish ecclesiastics serving in those islands for years and years past, it happens that there was one friar only—a Dominican Father, that hailed from Andalusia,—the one solitary specimen of that much reviled "peasant class." By the way, is it not a historical record that the ancestry of most of us Caucasians (the Judge, too, included) is traceable to the farming, or "peasant class," of the olden times? With some display of fair-mindedness Judge Taft, however, appears to deprecate the general anti-friar tone of his native witnesses. Again and again he records his opinion that neither religion nor morality was a factor to be considered in the Philippine question. Thus emphatically he declares it

"was not a religious question." [*Taft*, 30.]

Again, that

"the feeling against the friars is solely political." [*Ib.*]

And still again, that

"immorality (*of the friars*) was not the chief ground for hostility—" [*Ib.*, 29.]

while, moreover,

"their immorality as such (*he adds*) would not have made them hateful to the people . . . the people do not feel any ill will against (*the Filipino priests*) on this account." [*Ib.*]

And so on and so on; all which is very true, as according to the verdict of scholars (reiterated, moreover, by the Judge) no question of ethics is usually entertained by Katipuneros, or people of that stamp. And would it be out of place to inquire why, even if

true, the Judge then allowed all that "irrelevant" testimony to be published *in extenso*—in detail? Or, in view of the grave disedification resulting therefrom, if the charges against the defendants were false, why, in the interests of public decency, should he not have tried the friar case *in camera?*—a usage not uncommon in our courts where public welfare is in peril. Or, if ethics fails to account for this legal phenomenon at Manila of suppressing all testimony in favor of the defendants, while raking together everything, no matter how "irrelevant," to their discredit, may not mere politics be considered as the dominant factor therein?

But to return to our genesis of the Schurman reports. As to the nationality of his witnesses, who, according to the Doctor, "came in freely from all classes," etc., they were (he says) of various European and Asiatic races,—

"American, Austrian, Belgian, Chinese, English, French, German and Spanish." [*Schurman* i, 2.]

in appearance a rather imposing array of witnesses. But hardly to be borne out by the official tally. Of the names of the 46 witnesses, 28 clearly are Spanish, Philippine, or Chinese orthography, thus leaving just 18 as representatives of the six other countries in Caucasia. [See the index in *Schurman*, ii, 477-486.] Again, we may remark that while in any case involving local matters, institutions, etc., the testimony of residents, especially if of long standing, is, as a rule, perfectly admissible, strangers or new-comers are rigidly held as "incompetents." In these reports then we protest against the admission as evidence of the testimony or opinions of United States civilians or army or navy officers—all practically unfamiliar except from hearsay with matters and things transpiring in a very new country discovered, we may add, only a few months before. The first Commission, be it recalled, began its hearings in the summer of 1899. (At Manila, however, we are witnessing the subversion of other things besides Spanish.)

Then the Doctor goes on to describe the business, profession, etc., of the several witnesses, who (he says) were

"brokers, bankers, merchants, lawyers, physicians, railroad men, ship owners, educators, public officers." [*Schurman*, i, 2.]

—another captivating list of "men of all classes." But let us sift it in so far as Caucasians are concerned, reserving our remarks on native witnesses—Indians, mestizos, and the like, for future comment.

According to the minutes of the Court, of the Caucasian witnesses all but three (the teachers named ahead) were laymen, and as their evidence shows almost to a man anti-defendant, though some few, we admit, were non-committal. Now at Manila, is it likely any more than elsewhere, that mere civilians—men of affairs, however keen observers they may have been in matters relating to their own lines of business, or of occurrences happening before their own eyes,—is it likely that with topics relating to the higher life—with problems in religion, philanthropy, ethics, pedagogy, mission and church society work—all problems for experts—is it likely they could be any more conversant than our own fellow lay citizens at home?

Apparently only the three "educators" we have named elsewhere represented the Church side of the Philippine question, and they were examined merely (as said) on matters associated with their profession. In alleging then that his witnesses represented "all classes of the people," "all varieties of opinion," that, in brief, they were experts in the various fields of "political, civil and religious liberty," the Doctor would have us believe the thing which is not. As a matter of fact, though the churchmen in priestly orders in the islands numbered 1642, "many of them besides educated gentlemen of high moral standards," and usually "the only men of intelligence and education,"—all persons of worth and prominence therefore; though, moreover, there were hundreds and hundreds of officers—superintendents, teachers, connected with university, colleges, seminaries, pueblo schools and *beaterios*,—all experts in their respective fields of instruction, discipline, management; though besides there were many hospitals, asylums, orphanages, homes,—all centres one way or another of high-class Christian energy, in intellective, ethical and religious spheres, yet with the exception of the three "educators" named, no others were heard by Dr. Schurman; not a prelate, nor school teacher, nor superintendent, nor officer of those numerous institutions of education, beneficence and charity at Manila

and elsewhere in the islands, appeared even in person or by proxy.[12]

And with such *lacunae* in the testimony we are expected to take these reports as full and authentic pictures of Philippine society, life and manners! What, then, did Dr. Schurman mean in alleging that his witnesses represented "all classes," "all opinions"?

In plain English, however, is this not "putting the thing which is for the thing which is not"?—an unfairness so obvious as prior to the assembly of the second Commission to call for strong protest on the part of the Church authorities at Manila. Thus we learn from Judge Taft's report, that the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Chapelle

> "requested that in any investigation into the matter of the friars, . . . the provincials of the orders, and the five bishops, including the archbishop of Manila, who were all of them friars, should be given a hearing." [*Taft*, 24.]

So defendants in a case of supreme interest had to solicit as favor what the law gives as right!

Moreover, of the 422 pages of testimony in the Schurman reports, consisting mainly of denunciations of friardom, only 19 in all are allotted to the evidence of the three defendants, who were questioned solely on matters relating to pedagogy.

Considerable mystery, by the way, seems to veil the compilation of these reports. Judge Taft, in describing the mode of procedure followed by his fellow commissioners, states that

> "much formal evidence was taken and transcribed, but more was gathered from informal conversation when no stenographer was present." [*Taft*, 15.]

An admission that seems to mean a great deal more than it looks. So this is the way law was interpreted at Manila, and problems of the highest interest determined "from informal conversation," gathered, too, when "no stenographer was present!"

But there are conundrums, not a few, that meet us in our

[12] Should any of these various experts have been summoned, or invited to appear before the Schurman Commission, we have no information; his reports being utterly silent thereon.

study of these and similar vagaries of judicialism at Manila—the court proceedings of A. D. 1899–1900—gleams of such steady and unrelieved one-sidedness throughout, that we cannot but return to the belief grounded on our analysis of these legal forms, that by some skilful pre-arrangement (formerly known as "hocus-pocus"—a very ancient legal technicality), the reports of the Commissioners were to be "drawn up, of course according to the evidence," unless it might seem advisable (such things do at times happen)—to have the evidence somehow or other correspond with the reports. Such idiosyncrasies, we have heard, are among the mysteries and intricacies of modern law.

The witnesses that appeared before Judge Taft numbered, as said, twelve. But from a study of his reports we find that some 200 or 300 others—all natives, it seems, of Luzon, and strong for the prosecution, appeared before his Commission by deposition. Thus there is a paper signed by 97 "headmen and leading residents" of Aringay in Union province [*Sen. Doc.*, 198], another presented by "Clemente Mapuraya and 72 others," the "*presidente*, counsellors and inhabitants" of Pamplona in Cagayan province [*Id.*, 220], a third from "Sofio Alemdt and others . . . leading men and residents" of Tayabas [*Id.*, 224], and a fourth with 84 signatures from Nueva Cáceres [*Id.*, 225].[13]

A word merely about these "headmen and leading residents" of Luzon, all Indians, or mestizos. From their depositions, it appears (as already said) that through and through they were to a man all strong anti-defendants, in every way, even if not, as may be deduced from their language, anti-Christian also, just the kind of people too, I suppose, that Judge Taft has so frequently characterized as "ignorant," "credulous," "uneducated," etc. However, as witnesses against the defendants they seemed to have been rated among the "competent," as on their evidence, in part, the Judge has based his report, though it is hard to understand why elsewhere he should seek to discredit his own tools.[14]

[13] The *cabeça de barangay* = headman, was a petty Indian chieftain, head of a settlement, or pueblo, of about one hundred families. The "leading residents," very likely, were his subjects.

[14] There is no entry to show the domicile of Mapuraya, and associates, likely Luzonians, however, as were the others.

We go back again to our Caucasian witnesses for the defence,—defendants themselves, fourteen in all, counting the two pedagogical experts (as said) who appeared before the two Commissions twice.

Before Judge Taft appeared the following eleven defendants: Santiago Paya, provincial of the Dominicans;[15] Juan Villegas, provincial of the Franciscans; José Lobo, provincial of the Augustinians; Francisco Araya, provincial of the Recoletos; Alphonso Maria de Morertin, superior of the Capuchins; Juan Sabater, superior of the Benedictines; Miguel Saderra y Mata, vicar superior of the Jesuits; superior of the Lazarists (name not recorded); Bernardino Nozaleda y Villa, O.S.D., Archbishop of Manila; Andrés Ferrero, Recoleto Bishop of Santa Isabel of Jaro; the Bishop of Vigan (name not recorded). The evidence given by these church representatives is in *Sen. Doc.* [47–133].

That they were persons of considerable importance in ecclesiastical and civil fields we have these admissions of Judge Taft, who, besides styling them "educated gentlemen of high moral standards," states that

> "the priest was not only the spiritual guide (*of the Philippines*), but that he was in every sense the municipal ruler." [*Taft*, 26.]
> "The truth is (*he goes on to say*) that the whole government of Spain in these islands rested on the friars." [*Id.*]

Eulogy enough, we may add, but not wholly warranted by either facts or history. The Judge, in attributing Mikado-like prerogatives and powers to Philippine churchmen, runs counter to historical records of the last one hundred years or so.

Chronicles of those islands, state-papers of Governors-general, etc., refer continually to conflicts of power between the missionaries and the bureaucrats of Manila and Madrid,—the latter a hungry horde of civilians in alliance with Free Masons, *Liberales*, then Liga members and Katipuneros. The one doing their best to shield the natives from pillage, extortion, tyranny on the part of native alcaldes and Spanish officialdom,—the bane at times of our own Indian missions; the others just as intent in filling their pockets, as also at times is done by some of our own syndicates of money-seekers masquerading too often as philanthropists.

[15] Fathers Paya and Saderra had appeared as witnesses before the first Commission.

Thus it was in the Philippines. Has the Judge never read of the "hemp trust" and "tobacco trust" engineered at Madrid in order to "bleed" the natives of Panay and Cagayan?

At Washington in the Library of Congress is a work of the Madrid press more than half a century old, that, with details in plenty relating to the olden time, shows up the sharp dealings of Caucasian exploiters in Luzon, Panay, Cebú, and other islands, during the last century and even earlier.[16] Here is merely one instance of many recorded in our *Diccionario* of State interference with Church matters to the great distress of souls. In 1831 (August 25), Sanctos Gómez Marañon, Augustinian, Bishop of Cebú —head city of the Visayas, petitioned Ferdinand VII of Spain (and *patrono real*) for a division of his see, which (the Bishop stated) covered an immense area of countless islands and waters reaching all through the Visayas, then eastwardly as far as the Marianas. His plea was based on the clear fact that the greater number of souls in his care could never be visited by him,—could not be confirmed through Holy Chrism.

Among other arguments in support of his plea, the Bishop relates that right after his consecration, he visited the isle of Romblón, and three provinces in Panay, where he confirmed 102,636 Christians; thence to the isle of Negros, then back to Cebú, where in one-half only of that island he confirmed (those of Panay included) 23,800 souls, though it took him one-half year for the task. Moreover, he pleads that his charge embraced a million at least of souls, scattered through many islands, of which he names only the larger, Romblón, Samar, Leite, Bohol, Surigao, Negros, Tablas, Sibuyan, Banton, Panay, and Cebú.

He prays then that a see be established with headquarters at the city of Santa Isabel of Jaro, in Panay isle, with care, too, of the Calamianes and Zamboanga in Mindanao—two regions that with the Marianas he had never been able to visit. This petition to the crown was in 1831. But Santa Isabel witnessed no bishop

[16] See *Diccionario Geográphico, Estadístico, Histórico de las Philipinas*, etc., [Madrid, 1850, in two vols.] by two Augustinian scientists, Manuel Buzeta and Felipe Bravo. Then, too, should be studied the *Estadismo* of that brave assailant of crown villainies in the Philippines,—the Augustinian traveller and chronicler Zuniga. [Retana ed., Madrid, 1893.]

of its own until thirty-four years later, when (on May 27, 1865), the then Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IX, created that see.[17]

With such shilly-shallying at court one need feel little surprise at the fact that for one hundred years or so the welfare of Christian missions in the East as well as elsewhere depended largely on the whims of bureaucrats at Madrid, who (at Lisbon as well) were apt to be in continual conflict with the Holy See on many a question of etiquette, etc., among them church preferments, benefices, and the like.

No. In the many statements of Judge Taft, that up to late times churchmen held "supreme power" in the Philippines, lies a grave blunder against history. Once, yes, many, many years ago, up to the close of about the eighteenth century, when the Church was in friendly alliance with Cæsar in spirituals and temporals, then, perhaps, you would have seen the pueblo-missions of Luzon and its sister-isles civilized, prosperous, happy, so well as to deserve the epithet "Pearl of Malaysia"—a picture of almost Utopian grandeur and ethic beauty, as was that other charming lovely Christian mission-field of the Jesuits in Paraguay.

Some Facts of Philippine Story.

Here, relative to old-time Philippine story, are a few facts that have been enshrined in the pages of many a chronicler.

1. As a rule, not a Spanish soldier in the Philippines, except maybe in Manila in garrison.

2. At no time had Spain over 5,000 peninsulars in the whole archipelago.

3. All the islands were policed by Indians—natives, under friars, who guarded them from Chinese pirates and Moros.

The writer opines that even yet Cebuans remember with loving reverence their heroic fighting missionary of three-quarters of a century ago, Julian Bermejo,[18] of the Augustinians, who, with

[17] For the plea in full of Bishop Marañon, see Buzeta-Bravo, *ut ante* [i, 543, 544].

[18] Wrongly named "Ruiz" in his otherwise manly and enthusiastic paper in defence of Philippine churchmen, "The Work of the Friars," by Stephen Bonsal, in *North American Review* for October, last year. [See pp. 449-460.] Mr. Bonsal's paper was republished a few months ago by the "International Catholic Truth Society," of New York.

his well-drilled *corps* of Indians, spearmen and bowmen, with his little fleet of ten armored *barangayanes*—a kind of war canoe, supplied with falconets, and even with a well-equipped signal-service (with telegraphs from village to village) along the coast, kept Visaya waters fairly clear of Mahometan Jolo corsairs. (Father Bermejo, who off and on was *cura* of several pueblos in Cebú from 1802 to 1848, died at Cebú in 1851, on April 30.)

4. Apart from the usual local outbreaks, generally in Tagaldom (some of them fierce enough), history shows an era almost unbroken of peace and comfort.

5. Everywhere in those islands for generations back to the re-discovery, schools sufficient in number for plain and forest natives.

6. Steadily without a break the population of the islands on the increase from the first general census in 1732 down.

Such are storied facts, all of public record, that it may be useful to consider in our study of Philippine problems. With money-grabbers and Voltaireans kept aloof from our Indians, they were fairly comfortable and happy, with their friar guardians as pioneers in the field of higher and nobler activities, as promoters of civilization, industries, arts, as upholders of law and order, of mission-churches, schools,—the self-same factors, in brief, who, with their advent to Malaysia in the sixteenth century, had borne thither with the blessings of spiritual Christian refinement the boons of material art also,—letters, trades, commerce.

But to conclude with this bit of philosophic analysis of our Commissioners' reports. We are told by the Doctor that in their solemn judicial assembly at Manila

"Every witness said what he wanted to, and the Commission cordially invited all kinds of witnesses to appear."[19] [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]—

a statement implying, as the reader will notice, utmost license of speech on the part of the witnesses for the prosecution. They

[19] Notice may here be taken of Dr. Schurman's fondness for broad and very indefinite generalizations, as "men of all classes," "all classes of the people," "all varieties of opinion," "all the great questions of the day," and "every witness said what he wanted to," etc. But does such use of "indefinites" accord fully with historical accuracy?

certainly seem to have gone beyond bounds. One of them, with almost flippant air, has even proclaimed the infamy of his own mother. [Don Felipe Calderón in *Sen. Doc.*, 139.] Others similarly speak to the dishonor of their own friends and relatives.

Yes. We can well believe that in this regard Dr. Schurman speaks truly—that "every witness said what he wanted." But in our Manila court was there no one—no officer then to call witnesses to order, to have them bridle their speech?

With this we close our sketch of the genesis of the two Commissions, and the mode of procedure observed by them,

"in the maintenance of order, peace, and public welfare," etc. [*Schurman*, i, 186.]

Preliminary Conclusions.

Preliminary to our conclusions thereon we think then the following points (inspired by these reports) have been proved, viz.: that as regards the defendants—

1. The field of testimony opened by the prosecution was practically unlimited.

2. The witnesses with the exception of fourteen, but in reality twelve, were many of them of the mere riff-raff of Manila, the most cosmopolitan city, it may be said, of Asia, if not of the world.

3. No testimony was barred, everything — hearsay, town-gossip, slander—all was admitted.

4. There was no proper representation for the defence.

5. No provision for the verification of "evidence."

6. None for cross-examination.

7. While some of the judges at least were on record as anti-defendants,—the whole proceeding therefore one of such legal unseemliness it would seem as in any court of review would inevitably call for rebuke, if not reversal of judgment.

APPENDIX.

Among the many very singular phenomena in the four volumes of the Philippine reports that merit special study we single out the following as of interest to our readers. They refer to—

1. The interrogatories employed by the Commissioners in their examination of native witnesses.

2. Character of native witnesses as described by their fellow-prosecutors.

3. School facilities and school work in the Philippines, etc.

INTERROGATORIES PUT TO NATIVE WITNESSES.

As to the questions put by the second Commission to native witnesses we are told that they were determined by the Commission itself [*Sen. Doc.*, 255], though prepared by Judge Taft [*id.*, 197], then published in the Manila papers, besides being communicated to the witnesses in written or printed from. [*Id.*, 192 212.]

The questions, nineteen in number, were the following:[20]

1. How long have you lived in the Philippines?
2. In what parts of the islands have you lived?
3. How much personal opportunity had you before 1896 to observe the relations existing between the friars and the people of their parishes in a religious, in a social, and in a political way?
4. How many friars have you known personally?
5. From what class of society were they drawn in Spain?
6. What agricultural, or business, or residence property, in any part of the islands do you know from which any order of friars has derived income?
7. What political functions were actually exercised by the parish priests in the islands under Spanish rule?
8. What usually were the relations between the heads of the Spanish Government here and the heads of the Church?
9. What fees were actually collected by the parish priests for marriages, burials, and christenings? How were they fixed, if you know? What, if any, was the effect of such fees upon the marriages?
10. What was the morality of the friars as parish priests? How much opportunity have you had to observe? Can you give me instances? If so, please do so.
11. What do you think is the chief ground for hostility to the friars as parish priests? Does it exist against all the orders? Why the difference?
12. Charges have been made against the friars that many of their number have caused the deportation of Filipinos, members of their parishes, and that in some instances they were guilty of physical cruelty. What, if anything, do you know on the subject?
13. What is to be said of the morality of the native priests?
14. What as to their education and preparation to discharge clerical duties?

[20] In *Sen. Doc.*, 213–219, the questions are given in detail.

15. What do you think would be the result of an attempt of the friars to return to their parishes?

16. What do you think would be the effect in the islands of the appointment of an American archbishop?

17. What do you think of the establishment of schools in which opportunity would be given the ministers of any church to instruct the pupils in religion half an hour before the regular hour? Would this satisfy the Catholics of the islands in their desire to unite religion with education?

18. Will not the fact that parish priests, whoever they may be, will have no political functions, and no political influence, and must depend on the voluntary contributions of their parishioners for their support, very much change the relation of the priest to the people?

19. What do you think would be the effect of the Government expropriating the agricultural property justly belonging to the friars, paying what it is worth, selling it out in small parcels, and using the proceeds for a school fund?

Such, then, were the problems in various realms of science—in political economy, pedagogy, state-craft, etc., submitted to the native witnesses for solution—conundrums, the most of them, that might easily puzzle scholarly Caucasians, not to speak of an "ignorant, credulous, and childlike people," as Judge Taft has termed the inhabitants of the Philippines.

The reader will recall, moreover, that, according to the Judge's very emphatic declaration, the Philippine question was not "religious," but "merely political;" that "immorality," etc., was not concerned therein. Then, perhaps, in view of this deliberate oft-repeated protestation of the Judge, he will inquire, why should the Judge, when framing these interrogatories, have put into the heads of his friar-hating witnesses—Caucasian and Katipuneros—the very subjects even that he so steadily, so positively, had declared were "irrelevant?" Why, too, have paraded their answers? Was this movement, as well as others, decreed by the secret anti-Catholic propaganda of Manila, or maybe London? Katipuneros, it may be remarked, are members of a secret league in the Philippines, chiefly in Luzon, patterned on Masonic models. Herein, not very unlike other anti-Christian organizations, they are not apt to let such things as morals or church discipline trouble their conscience. Nor have Katipuneros ever been noted as steady church-goers any more than their white brethren of secret-society lodges in America and Europe.

NATIVE OR MESTIZO WITNESSES.

An important feature in these reports, as observed when making our analysis thereof, was the fact that the testimony of native or mestizo witnesses served largely as their basis.

We give here some select tributes to their worthlessness as citizens, men of business, etc.

Our quotations, the reader is to observe very closely, are not drawn from Spanish sources. They are taken from the testimony of the Commissioners' own Caucasian witnesses—anti-friars on the whole, the same as these natives. Following are several characterizations:

"The Chinese half-breeds are causing all the trouble." [Testimony of Edwin H. Warner, *Schurman*, ii, 19.]

"The disturbing element is really of mixed blood—the Chinese, and Japanese, and Tagalogs. . . . You can't conceive of a people where there is a worse mixture." [Test. of Neil McLeod, *id.*, ii, 41.]

". . . the worst race . . . the Chinese mestizo or half-caste . . . treacherous and unreliable, but they are smart . . . cunning." [Test. of Wm. A. Daland, *id.*, ii, 167.]

"There is no business morality among them (*the Chinese*) . . . the mestizos . . . are very tricky; you can't put much confidence in them." [Test. of R. W. Brown, *id.*, ii, 205.]

". . . the mestizo . . . is a bad lot right through." [Test. of H. D. C. Jones, *id.*, ii, 216.]

"Usually he (*the mestizo*) is a very mean sort of a man." [Test. of Edwin H. Warner, *id.*, ii, 199.]

Even the Judge himself makes this admission that

"the number of Filipinos who are fitted by nature, education, and moral stability to fill such (*judicial*) positions is very small. Very few can be found among them in whose integrity and ability business men have confidence." [*Taft*, 83.]

While the genial, upright describer of the Philippines, Mr. Sawyer, a resident there for fourteen years, employs these terms:

"I should not like to place (*he says*) my affairs in the hands of a Tagal lawyer, to trust my life in the hands of a Tagal doctor, nor to

purchase an estate on the faith of a Tagal surveyor's measurement." [21]

Thus has one half of the prosecution's own witnesses, we may say, spoken against the other half. The friars in the Philippines have been styled "an element of discord." But do the above gems of high-class anthropology—science of our fellow man—display any marked degree of harmony among the anti-defendants themselves?

Another point as to these friar-hating Malays—their testimony, which was accepted as legal and competent by our Commissioners. All through the evidence of these Filipinos—natives, half-breeds, or Chinese (given by both Commissioners in their reports), runs one continued strain of invective, obloquy, slander, against their former teachers and missionaries,—on the whole a parrot-like repetition, page after page, of street tales, gossip and hearsay, relating to what we may style the "Maria-Monk" kind of romances about "the secret life of churchmen," "church tariff extortions," "abuse of confessional secrets," etc., etc. Yet from this wearisome and long-spun-out sameness of language, in their testimony, the student, if he examines it closely, will note two very remarkable psychological phenomena, that will prove incentives to considerable reflection thereon. One is the fact that apparently through some singular secret and mysterious influence these "ignorant, uneducated" hillsmen and plainsmen of Luzon all have employed almost the very same turns of thought, the very same figures of speech, the very same references to past events, even of ages ago, and so on. [See *Sen. Doc.* for the testimony of these native witnesses from Felipe Calderón's, p. 133, to Francisco Alvarez's, p. 265.] One somewhat amusing instance of this peculiar "thought coincidence," as we may call it, is the reference by as many as eight native witnesses, among them our "headmen and leading residents" of Aringay, to the case of Archbishop Sancho in the eighteenth century.[22]

[21] *The Inhabitants of the Philippines*, by Frederic H. Sawyer, etc., New York, 1900 (p. 237), a book well worth reading for its keen observations of matters and things in general in those islands.

[22] See in *Sen. Doc.* the testimony of the following: Torres, 186; Ros, 194; the Aringay delegation, 200; Templo, 208; del Fierro, 214; Mercado, 251; Mijares, 254; Alvarez, 258.

The experience of this prelate—Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Santa Rufina, an Aragonese, member of the Pious Schools, and for twenty years Archbishop of Manila, from 1767 to 1787, when he died, has so far sufficed for his successors in that see.

Through a fancy that hitherto native talents had somehow wrongly been kept hidden, the Archbishop, who, when in Spain, had displayed great activity in the suppression of Jesuits—(it was the era of the new infidel re-birth [?] of Europe)—withdrew all regulars in the Philippines from parish care, and gave their charges to native incumbents. These Indians were ordained by him in such numbers as to give rise to a saying at Manila that

"*Que no se encontraban bogadores para los pancos, porque a totos los habia ordenado el arzobispo,*"

—"One need not look any longer for boatmen, as the Archbishop has ordained them all." With this result in brief, as to his chagrin the Archbishop discovered shortly after while on a visit throughout Luzon, that the missions had gone to wreck and ruin —churches, schools, *conventos*, libraries, all in decay.

Not long after, the European regulars were restored to their former duties as *parrocos*, with the natives as formerly coadjutors.[23]

Could it be possible, then, and yet nothing easier might have happened, that all these Katipuneros (Caucasians even included) were carefully drilled beforehand as to their anti-friar evidence—were in brief "coached," though rather stupidly, as sometimes our court chronicles declare is done here?

The other psychological phenomenon discloses to us on analysis a no less singular instance of what I might style, in default of perhaps a neater term, "thought transference," or "psychical absorption." The reports of Judge Taft contain the testimony of several Luzonians, wherein, interlarded with their anti-friar evidence, are some pure Americanisms, such as the semi-slang expression "O. K," that exceedingly quickly, it appears, had been introduced by these Filipinos into their native speech after an acquaintanceship with Americans of only a few months. The "O.K."

[23] Sketches of this era may be read in *Estadismo* (*ut supra*), by the Augustinian Zuñiga, [Retana ed, ii, 279]. It is referred to also by Buzeta-Bravo—*Diccionario* [ii, 278 *b*].

enters into the testimony of at least four islanders.[24] Or, may be —an explanation that will suggest itself to our mind—maybe the testimony itself of these uncultured folk was just "cooked." Enough, however, for these native witnesses, who seem therein something like our own half-breeds at home, of various colors, the same as in Malaysia.

Long ago European churchmen in the Philippines were not slow in learning of the character of those islanders, that among racial peculiarities they were given to many virtues—to piety, devotion, obedience, and in subordinate positions even trustworthiness. Herein, I may observe, they are not very unlike our own North American Indians. But the churchmen learned besides that their wards, however docile and really faithful, were apt to get "out of gear" with any regular system of life, to show themselves flighty-minded, changeable, when one would least expect it.

So as the Church has always recognized the advantages of having a native clergy, co-workers with Europeans on missionary lines, these natives, little by little, were raised to sacred orders, as assistants, coadjutors, under the eye, however, of a Spaniard, to preach, instruct, visit the sick, and administer the Sacraments of Holy Church. But as a rule natives were not admitted to higher offices. The experience of Archbishop Sancho was a lesson for good. Nor was any native ever raised to the episcopate, unless at the most as coadjutor. Nor, for similar reasons too, did the orders in all these centuries admit natives to the habit of their brotherhood but rarely. Since the year 1641, as far as I can discover, the Augustinians have invested with their religious garb only 43 Indians, among them the skilled botanist, Father Ignacio Mercado, a mestizo of Parañaque (born in 1648, died at Bauan in 1698), Dominicans, 25; Franciscans, 16; Recoletos, about 25.

Pueblo Schools in the Philippines, etc.

Common schools for Indians were established, of record, in every Christianized district of these vast archipelagos, as adjuncts to their pueblo churches—feeders, too, in a way of the many institutions of higher learning already named in these pages—colleges,

[24] See in *Sen. Doc.* for the "O. K." the testimony of Tayera, 159 *bis.*; Templo, 205; Mercado, 250; Alvarez, 256.

seminaries, *beaterios*. Let the reader recall the words of Judge Taft in speaking of the chief inspectors and superintendents of these little pueblo shrines of the Christian Minerva, that the priests, " men of intelligence and education," were " many of them gentlemen of high moral standards."

As to the mass of literature, too, in the Philippines bearing on the higher sciences, industries and arts, these are noted in the Commissioners' reports only by their utterly unexplainable absence. Neither Dr. Schurman, nor Judge Taft, seems to have been acquainted with Philippine bibliography, even by name, or aware even faintly of the many gems of literature in those islands in such diverse fields as history and mechanics, linguistics and music, theology and physics, with a lot more on poetry, folk-lore, and so on. This absence of one of the brilliant intellectual glories of the Philippines (in the Commissioners' reports) is another of the several *lacunae* noticed in their works.

Nor do they seem to have been aware of this other fact that during the closing years of the sixteenth century, when the earliest printing-press of record in the Philippines was set up in Luzon, Manila hailed its first publication, not (as believed by many) the Tagal *Arte* of the Dominican philologist Blancas, in 1602, nor the *tratadillos* that issued from the convent-press of the Augustinians at Lubao in 1606, but two booklets instead on Christian Doctrine, —*doctrinas*, as they were entitled, one in Tagal and Spanish, the other in Chinese, both printed, or rather xylographed, from blocks, at Manila, or its suburb, Binondo, in 1593. Positive evidence of these publications (no longer, however, extant) is in Simancas *Archivo*, among the state papers of Philip II,—a letter of official character, of June 20, 1593, addressed to that monarch by Gómez Pérez Dasmariñas, Governor-General of the Philippines.[25]

Moreover, bibliographers of the Philippines record the titles of 3000 works and upwards, many of them reëditions, that relate to matters and things in those islands. In his *Imprenta* Retana gives a list of Philippina with their titles, name of author, printer, with date and place of publication from 1593 (as said) to

[25] Thus the bibliophile Retana, in his story of the Philippine press, *La Imprenta en Filipinas* [1593–1810], Madrid, 1897 (p. 5.), where he states that he read the Dasmariñas letter, published also (he remarks) by his fellow antiquarian Medina.

1810. For the sixteenth century two works are named,—the *Doctrinas*, of Binondo; for the seventeenth, 150; for the eighteenth, 341; while in the nineteenth century, during its nine opening years, 24 works were printed, or a total in all of 517 books, which, with 24 others of doubtful date, make 541 monuments of the printing art in Luzon, up to the year 1810. Among these philological treasures are twenty-three *Artes*, or grammars, in Tagal, Pampango, Ilocano, Bicol, Bisaya-Hiligayna, Bisaya of Leyte and Samar, and Pangasinan; then eleven dictionaries, one in Japanese, another in the dialect of Tankui, a tribe of Indians in an out-of-the-way place in the Zambales country around Subig bay in Luzon. The other dictionaries are in Tagal, Bisaya, Pampango, and Bicol.[26]

Now of all this and similar evidence concerning education and intellectual activities in the Philippines, which it seems the spirit of ordinary honesty would not have excluded from their reports, not one word even has been recorded by the Commissioners. "But really they were not supposed to turn antiquarians." Very true. Why then have loaded the pages of their reports with references to archæological—old-time iniquities—scandals largely, however, mere oriental fairy-tales, to the discredit of contemporaneous churchmen? (Scientific antiquarianism, like any other art, works both ways.)

But with this not very irrelevant digression on books, we return to our pueblo schools, rather low-grade educational centres however, established throughout our Christian Malaysia, yet withal very helpful agencies, along with their much nobler fellow institutions of far higher rank in the capitals of the Luzon provinces, in uplifting these islanders to fairly civilized planes. For (be it stoutly said) old-time writers as well as modern, visitors, travellers, sojourners, even non-Catholic, descant in sometimes glowing terms of praise for the marvels of ethic grandeur among these Christian Malays, their many personal and social virtues, the air of general peacefulness in their pueblos, their hospitality towards strangers, respect for authority, safety of travel by day or

[26] Something of interest relating to books, etc., in these Malaysian archipelagos, will be found in a pamphlet (by the writer) published by the Free Library of Philadelphia, in 1900. [See *Some Notes on Philippine Bibliography*, etc.]

night, and, above all, the modesty of their women. So that it is easily credible that in many provinces illiteracy was so uncommon that (as told by many an annalist) "you'd barely find boy or girl that couldn't read and write."[27]

As pertinent to pedagogy, therefore to ethics, the writer has the following experience from the lips of an old Philippine resident: that "though (such are his words) he travelled at times through the principal islands—Luzon, Panay, Cebú—in all his sojourn he never once at night fastened the door of his sleeping chamber; never heard of molestation to traveller in mountain-pass, forest, plain, or highway; nor even of thievery, let alone robbery, or other violence to person or property."

But with this digression we get back to our 2140 literary oases in these tropical lands, where instruction suitable to native needs was given pretty much anywhere—in *convento*—solid building, or nipa hut; it mattered little, so long as school kept in.

And here is the schedule of studies, adopted by these little Indian science and trade schools, as recorded by Dr. Schurman:

PUEBLO SCHOOL-COURSE IN THE PHILIPPINES, ETC.

"Instruction in schools for natives shall for the present be reduced to elementary-primary instruction and shall consist of—

1. Christian doctrine and principles of morality and sacred history suitable for children.
2. Reading.
3. Writing.
4. Practical instruction in Spanish, including grammar and orthography.
5. Principles of arithmetic, comprising the four rules for figures, common fractions, decimal fractions, and instruction in the metric system with its equivalents in ordinary weights and measures.
6. Instruction in general geography and Spanish history.
7. Instruction in practical agriculture as applied to the products of the country.
8. Rules of deportment.
9. Vocal music." [*Schurman*, i, 31.]

[27] Thus Buzeta, in his *Diccionario* (*ut ante*, i, 161 *b*), relates of Hilarion Diez, the Augustinian provincial of his order, as well as Archbishop of Manila in 1826, who was wont to say that there was a multitude of pueblos, as Argao, Dalaguete, Boljoón in Cebú, and many in the province of Iloilo—"*en los que es difícil hallar un solo niño ó niña que no sepa leer y escribir.*"

That is to say, in the islands were the following boys' schools and others devoted exclusively to girls, of the four-fold grade—*entrada* (or entrance primary-schools), then *ascenso, termino de secunda,* and *termino de primera.*

	BOYS'.	GIRLS'.	TOTAL.
Philippines	1082	1047	2129
Marianas	2	2	4
East Carolines	2	2	4
West Carolines	2	1	3
	1088	1052	2140

Our Philippine Indians then,—and are they really so different from their red brethren here?—seem to have been fairly well provided with technical learning, enough at least for their duties of life. They were taught to be honest, upright men and women; to rule their households justly; to honor God; to begin and end the day with prayer; to tell no lies; and thus be contented and happy in spirit. (Old histories tell of the Philippines that the natives were a joyful, happy, light-hearted people.) "But it is not high-class education!" Maybe not. Yet our civil-service commissioners, it seems, would gladly welcome a school-course just as good.

As regards the system of Philippine education too the student of pedagogy must reflect that, except some pueblo "lock-ups"—*carcels,* in the islands were no state-prisons (except at Manila), no asylums for indigents, no penitentiaries, no houses of refuge, no poor-houses, no reformatories (except the Magdalen Retreat at Manila), and, to the glory of Philippine Christianity be it said, until a very few years ago, no houses of disorderly character.[28]

Nor were there any truant-officers in the Philippines,—all adjuncts pretty much of modern civilization as inspired and much regulated, and greatly tinkered with by our *doctrinaire* politicians.

And here is the law requiring attendance at school, from the same Commissioner's reports:

[28] At Manila houses of ill-fame were officially protected (otherwise licensed) first in or about 1888, under José Centeno y Garcia, Civil Governor *ad interim.* (From *The Katipunan, or the Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune.* By Francis St. Clair. Manila: Tip. "Amigos del Pais," Palacio 258. 1902. [Pp. 61, 65.]

LAW OBLIGING SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

Primary instruction is obligatory for all natives. The fathers, tutors, or guardians of children shall send them to the public schools between the ages of 10 and 12 years, unless they prove that they give them sufficient instruction in their homes or in private schools. Those who do not obey this rule shall be admonished by the authorities, and compelled to do so by a fine of from one-half real to 2 reals (3 to 13 cents gold at the present rate of exchange !), *when there is a school in the town at such a distance that the children can conveniently attend.* The fathers and guardians of children *may* also send them to the schools between the ages of 6 and 14 years. [*Schurman*, i, 32.][29]

In praise of these petty pueblo schools, of their curriculum and general proficiency as educational agencies, despite many drawbacks (noticed by Dr. Schurman) on the part of civil—official—intermeddling, we have these testimonials, all from the prosecution's own witnesses:

"In the different provinces there are lawyers and doctors, and professional men who are very well educated." [Test. of J. F. McLeod in *Schurman*, ii, 9.]

While in answer to the question: "What proportion of the people of Batangas can read and write?" Señor Felipe Gonçalez Calderón says:

"Seventy-five or eighty per cent. The province is the most cultured in the Archipelago. I have some 600 laborers on my plantation in Batangas, and of these there are certainly not more than twenty who cannot read and write." [Test. *id.*, ii, 67, 68.]

Even Judge Taft himself, though (as usual) in rather begrudging terms, admits that the Filipinos,

"as a rule, . . . possess mechanical skill, and they excel in writing and drawing." [*Taft*, 105.]

Then, too, that

"the Filipinos are born musicians, and, under normal conditions, buy a good many pianos." [*Id.*, 61.]

(In our own Indian schools "out West," I wonder whether our aborigines are taught drawing and music? or have they "many pianos" in their pueblos?)

[29] In the "school law" printed above the sentence in curved lines (with the exclamation mark) and the italics seem to be Dr. Worcester's; the paper in this volume on "Education" having been compiled by him.

Enough admissions, we think, that the Philippines had schools, plenty of them, where pupils were taught even fine arts thoroughly as well as industrial, but above all good behavior, which for colored or white men is all essential for happy life. But had the Commissioners been really in earnest in search for evidence of good school work to add to their reports thereon, that have been by some enthusiasts styled as "complete, elaborate, sound,"[30] —evidence, too, of the strongest character throughout all those isles, that was before their very eyes to be seen even yet by all men, though much of it no doubt is now in ruins, they would have described at least briefly the handiwork of those missionary pedagogues and their pueblo alumni to be witnessed in the roads and bridges, in the irrigating and drainage canals, in the swamp and forest lands reclaimed for tillage, in the pueblo churches, and pueblo convents, and pueblo buildings, all erected by those self-same industrious and skilful natives. who, whether slaves and peons, as pictured by romancers, or freemen like our own American aborigines (it matters little), were yet taught honest labor,—the elements at least, of useful and beautiful arts, the way to keep to their task, to labor, too, with a sense of nobleness and pride, as shown in their monuments, and (be it emphasized sturdily) their handiwork shows that they learned their business well.

And evidence of still higher character? Then, too, in all fairness should have been described by our Commissioners the many exemplars of architecture, painting, and sculpture, in Manila, and elsewhere in Cebú and Iloilo, in carving and engraving and chiselling, in dwellings, in town-halls, in church and school-buildings, all tokens of native skilfulness these, due in large meas-

[30] A few months ago we chanced to look over a paper—a kind of semi-political canonization of Judge Taft—in a prominent periodical (*North American* [monthly] for September, 1902, pp. 229–308, for "The New Philippine Government," by Sidney Webster), wherein, with some amazement, because of the unqualified and superlative admiration for the Judge, we read the following eulogies relating to his report, which is styled "elaborate . . . based on an official examination by Governor (*then Commissioner*) Taft . . ." Moreover, that "it is to be relied upon by the country, one would say, as presenting essential facts and sound conclusions." [P. 305.] In view, however, of some other "essential" facts that we have shown have been omitted by that self-same Judge, the writer in question is asked, in all seriousness, whether really he has ever studied Judge Taft's reports; or, he will excuse us for adding, did he ever even read them through?

ure to the benign and art-loving influence derived from their little pueblo schools through the painstaking energy of their *parrocos*, officers, guardians of their numerous church, social, and educational guilds.[31]

Yet, if we mistake not, so busy were the Commissioners with their investigations into Church political matters, they failed to recognize these art-grandeurs before their very eyes. For, though the scholarly taste of the Commissioners might not have cared much for mere material beauty, tastiness, skill, their broad judicial spirit, however, should not, we opine, have omitted some brief tribute at least to our ecclesiastical æsthetes in the Philippines.

Thus do we enshrine in our pages another collection of judicial *lacunae* relating to the elevating and ennobling influence in lofty ethical training given in those pueblo schools, working through the agency of religion to develop Christian manliness and womanliness, wherein rightly much is to be admired, nor little, if aught, to be greatly ashamed of.

But what do the Commissioners mean in saying

"From the beginning the (*pueblo*) schools were entirely under the supervision of the religious orders." [*Taft*, 105.]

When, as any student of Philippine or Spanish history should know, for the last one hundred years or so, school schedules, rules, and programmes, etc., in those islands, the same pretty much as in the rest of Caucasia, have been tinkered at by theorists of various political colors?

Or this of Dr. Schurman's, who, speaking of the weather remarks that

"it is often quite impossible for small children to attend school . . . on account of their distance from it . . ." [*Schurman*, i, 31.]

[31] In *El Archipiélago*, by Jesuit scholars, a large work of encyclopædical character, published by Government [Washington, 1900], and in *Gazetteer* (described ahead), we exult in the preservation through photographic views of very many of these monuments of ripe, cultured spirit, some so tasty, so majestic in appearance as to seem to our Western spirit masterpieces in a way of art-genius.

Well. In bad weather even in Pennsylvania "small children" (and big ones too) find it "impossible to attend" their own pueblo schools. Are churchmen, therefore, to be blamed for the weather in the Philippines, and the pupils' non-attendance therefore?

Then Dr. Worcester says that

"The only educational advantages obtainable by the common people of the Archipelago are those afforded by the primary schools." [*Schurman*, i, 17.]

No doubt. Even in our largest cities here in America, what other means of education than their own pueblo common schools has the great mass of white Tagals—the bread-winners of the world in mill, forge, mine and factory?

Again we find the Doctor complaining that

"the instruction in Spanish was in very many cases purely imaginary," . . . [*Id.* i, 31.]

No wonder. It's just like those bad Katipuneros to make this charge against our mission schools. Still has not Dr. Worcester heard at times that our own civil-service examiners find fault frequently with not only our pueblo schools, but institutions even of higher name, for very similar neglect?

But let us on to the end of our paper with the words of Judge Taft:

". . . the Philippine people belong to the Roman Catholic Church." [*Taft*, 23.]

"The Philippine people love the Catholic Church." [*Id.*, 30.]

And

"As the Catholic Church is and ought to continue a prominent factor in the life, peace, contentment, and progress of the Philippine people, . . . it would seem the wisest course, . . . to frame civil laws which shall accord with views conscientiously entertained by Catholics —priests and laymen . . ." [*Id.*, 33.]

Brave words these. Here at least we agree with the Judge, for, as in the past in Malaysia and elsewhere, as attested by the history of mankind, so in the future we heartily believe the only bulwark of law and order will be the Church of our forefathers, that ever has been the promoter of works leading to the higher life—of virtues, of heroisms, of letters, of sciences, of arts, which

find their complement in the fullest and noblest degree in monuments of all-round beneficence—in Christian schools, Christian asylums, Christian homes; monuments that in their grandeur and multitude and variety can be witnessed in no other land but Christian, in neither Moslem, Buddhist, nor heathen.

Final Conclusion.

To sum up then our conclusions. At the outset of this paper we charged the Philippine Commissioners with prejudice against the defendants. And we attacked their reports on many grounds as faulty for incompleteness, for inaccuracies, for unfairness—a kind of indictment, if you choose so to style it, that hinges on the twofold ground of faults of omission, faults of commission, in that the Commissioners kept in the background, out of sight, whatever evidence might make for the defendants, while at the same time they admitted—brought forward as evidence whatever would make for the prosecution.

Are we wrong, therefore, in contending that these reports cannot stand as historical documents on the score of omissions in matters of weighty importance; nor stand as judicial decisions on the score of manifold antagonisms therein against the defendant churchmen, against the evidence itself of the prosecution's own witnesses, against the evidence, too, of the Commissioners' own eyes?

Fr. Thomas C. Middleton, O.S.A.

Villanova College, Pa.

THE UNION OF THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH WITH THE HOLY ROMAN SEE.

AMONG writers upon early Irish history there is much diversity of views regarding the character of primitive Christianity established in the island by St. Patrick. Protestant historians have been at great pains to show that the Gospel preached by the Saint was not that which the Roman Catholic Church claims as her traditional creed; nay, some of them affect to disprove the truth of what our own Church historians generally accept as an estab-

lished fact, namely that St. Patrick received his mission to the inhabitants of Ireland directly from the Roman Pontiff.

The statement, supported by the "Book of Armagh," that Pope Celestine commissioned the Saint to go to Ireland, is met by Dr. Todd, of Dublin,[1] with an attempt to show that St. Patrick was not sent to Ireland until at least eight years after Celestine's death; Sir William Bethan[2] declares it as quite certain, that the Saint reached the shores of Ireland centuries before Celestine was born; while the ingenious Ledwich, not to be outdone in originality, asserts confidently that St. Patrick never existed at all, and that he and his apostolate should be relegated to the realms of myth and fable. With Irish Protestants of to-day Ledwich's bold theory is not much in favor. They rather prefer to retain St. Patrick; and to mould his life and teachings, so as best to support the latter-day claims of that moribund institution which arrogates to itself the title of the "Church of Ireland." And indeed Ussher, though he admits that St. Patrick received his mission from Pope Celestine, tells us, nevertheless, that the doctrine taught by the Saint was pure and simple Protestantism, and that, whatever injunctions he had from the Pope, as a matter of fact he established a Church which remained for centuries entirely independent of the Apostolic See.

Although the origin of these extravagant opinions classed as history, dates back to the time of Ussher, that is, the seventeenth century, they did not obtain much credence until about thirty years ago, when Irish Protestants, in view of threatening disestablishment and disendowment of their Church, sought to confirm their claims to State-patronage by showing the identity of Protestantism with the Primitive Irish Church of St. Patrick. Thus, all at once, Ussher's theory became immensely popular. From the hustings, from the Opposition benches of the House of Commons, from the class halls of Dublin University, from the pulpits of the Established Church, the Protestantism of ancient Ireland was asserted with such dogmatic confidence that it was caught up as political war-cry, and was echoed, and reëchoed loudly and universally, till Protestant Irishmen brought themselves actually

[1] *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland.* By James H. Todd. Dublin, 1864.

[2] *Irish Antiquarian Researches.* Dublin, 1827.

to believe it. Ever since then, the Irish Church Mission Society, and the Religious Tract Society, as well as the more bigoted and aggressive country parsons, shutting their eyes to the overwhelming mass of historical evidence against them, have insisted upon the identity of their Church with the Church that honors St. Patrick, St. Bridget, and St. Columkille.

In refutation of these pretensions I propose, in a cursory reference to Irish annals, to show that from its establishment the Irish Church was, in doctrine, government, and discipline, in perfect conformity with the Church of Rome. My principal object will be to direct attention to her acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff; and I insist on this particular point for two very substantial reasons. In the first place because it is a fact which the opponents of traditional Irish Catholicity most strenuously contest. In the second place it really touches the core of the difference between the Catholic Church and all the sects that claim the Christian name in Ireland. Hence by showing that the Irish Church acknowledged from the beginning and uninterruptedly the supremacy of the Apostolic See, we obtain proof positive that she held to all the doctrines and the chief disciplinary practices of the Church of Rome. My thesis is therefore, that the Irish Church was established at the command and under the auspices of the Roman Pontiff; and further, that the Papal authority in Ireland was acknowledged and enforced from the very beginning of the establishment of Christianity. To illustrate both contentions, in which I mean to be very brief, I shall also examine what were the actual doctrines held in the early Irish Church, and to demonstrate their agreement with those that were then, are now, and till the end of time shall be, taught and believed in the Roman Catholic Church.

That the Irish Church was established under the direction of the Pope, or, what comes to the same thing, that St. Patrick came to Ireland with a Papal commission, is so well attested by the earliest and best authorities, that Ussher, despite his prejudices, did not venture to deny it. The learned Dr. Todd of Trinity, in a work published little more than thirty years ago, was, as already stated, the first to reject the ancient tradition of the Irish Church, and he did so, as he informs us in the preface of his work,

on the ground that the evidence for it was not satisfactory in his eyes. I hope to show that the Roman mission of St. Patrick admits of abundant proof from the best authority.

It has, I think, been conclusively established by Dr. Graves, Protestant Bishop of Limerick, that the "Book of Armagh" could not have been written later than A.D. 807, though it might, as the learned O'Curry asserts, have originated a century earlier. In one of the MSS. of which this ancient record is made up and which is known as "Tirechan's Annotations," we read: "The Bishop Patrick was sent by Celestine, Bishop and Pope of Rome, to correct the Irish. This Celestine was the forty-fifth successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome." It is to be noted that this testimony of an ancient and venerable authority is very explicit in its simplicity, and has no trace of forgery about it. Thus it carries great historical weight.

Amongst the seven most ancient "Lives" of St. Patrick still extant, there is one in the British Museum, known as the "Tripartite." It was translated by Colgan from the old Gaelic original ascribed to St. Evin, who is generally admitted to have lived in the century succeeding that of St. Patrick. St. Evin says: "It was Celestine, Abbot of Rome, who read *grada* (orders) over him; Germanus and Amatho, the Romans, being present." The fourth Life of St. Patrick was written by St. Aileran, called "The Wise," who, according to the Four Masters, died in 664. St. Aileran writes, "Wherefore St. Germanus sent the Blessed Patrick to Rome, that with the permission of the Bishop of the Apostolic See he might go forth to preach, *for order so requireth.* But Patrick, having arrived at Rome, was most honorably received by the Holy Pope Celestine, and the relics of the Saint being delivered to him *he was sent into Ireland by Pope Celestine.*" This unequivocal testimony, from an early and reliable authority, would require no comment. It not only testifies to St. Aileran's belief that St. Patrick received his mission from the Roman Pontiff, but also that the Roman Pontiff was supreme over all the churches and missions; for what else can be the meaning of the words "for order so requireth"?

Another and very important witness strengthening our argument is Eric of Auxerre, a French monk of the ninth century.

He wrote a Life of St. Germanus of Auxerre, from whom it is generally believed St. Patrick received his religious and secular education. Speaking incidentally of St. Patrick in this work, Eric says, "Germanus sent him to holy Celestine, the Pope of the city of Rome, accompanied by his own priest Legetius, who might bear testimony of his ecclesiastical probity at the Apostolic See." Now Eric could have had no possible motive in fabricating or sustaining a particular theory about St. Patrick. He was a Frenchman, a stranger to Ireland, and his purpose was simply to give a true account of his fellow-countryman, St. Germanus. Yet here we have him, wholly uninfluenced by Irish tradition or by national prejudice, giving us the clear and independent testimony of St. Patrick's commission from Pope Celestine.

The testimonies I have briefly quoted are confirmed by the remaining celebrated biographies of St. Patrick written by St. Benignus, by Probus, by Nennius (in his history of the Britains), by Marcus, by Marianus, as also the history contained in the Annals of Innisfallen, by the scholastic who in the seventh century commented on St. Fiacc's Hymn (metrical Life of St. Patrick), and by quite a host of later writers. The conclusion is plain, for negative proofs are not sufficient to overthrow these very positive testimonies asserting that St. Patrick came to Ireland at the command of Pope Celestine.

But let us glance for a moment at what may he justly termed the negative arguments of those who deny the Catholic claim. The first of these arguments is deduced from the extant writings of St. Patrick. It is stated that the Saint's *language* is inconsistent with a Roman mission. If we ask what the precise "language" to which our adversaries refer, is, we learn that it is something *he did not say.* In other words, they argue thus: St. Patrick's Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus contain *no reference to his Roman mission.* Therefore the Roman mission was not a fact!

The argument speaks for itself; but it may be stated in addition that in the writings referred to there is no call whatever for a mention of St. Patrick's mission. The "Confession" was written by the Saint in his old age, when the great work of his life had been happily accomplished; in it he proposes to return thanks to God for the wonderful graces bestowed on himself, and on the

Irish nation; he takes occasion to exhort his spiritual children to perseverance, and in conclusion defends himself against some charges of presumption and incompetency made against him by his enemies. Though the "Confession" contains many facts of the Saint's early life, it is quite clear that it was never intended to be an autobiography. It was a *Confession* in the sense of a profession of faith or a testament in which there was no particular occasion to refer to his Roman mission. Dr. Todd thinks that an appeal to a commission from Rome would have been an unanswerable reply to those who charged St. Patrick with presumption in undertaking the conversion of Ireland. But it must be remembered that if the "Confession" was addressed to men who admitted the Papal supremacy, an appeal to a commission from Rome would have been quite unnecessary; and if addressed to those who denied or cared nothing for the Pope's supremacy, then such an appeal would have been useless. Certainly, if his enemies had charged against the Saint that he had undertaken his work without due authorization, then indeed, an appeal to a commission from the Apostolic See would have been an unanswerable reply. But such is not the case.

The main charge against the Saint apparently was that such a lowly and ignorant person as Patrick should have presumed *to seek or accept* this onerous duty of preaching the Gospel. Our great Apostle replies in a strain worthy of the pen of St. Paul. The keynote of his whole contention is an appeal to the goodness and omnipotence of Him who makes use of the weak things of this world to confound the strong. Like the Apostle of Nations he glories but in his own infirmities. He admits, he dilates on, his own lowliness, his sinfulness; and then pointing to the magnificent results that crowned his labors he confutes his accusers by asking whether the weak wretch that they took him justly to be, could have produced such effects without a divine vocation to his arduous task, or without divine aid in its execution. His sole object is to show that the finger of the Omnipotent was in his work, his sole desire that the glory of his success might be given to God. "I pray," concludes the "Confession," "that whatever little I have done or administered may not be referred to me, but be ye persuaded, and verily believe that it was the gift of God."

An appeal to a Roman mission would have been out of harmony with such a defence, since it would have emphasized the fact from which his humility shrank, namely, that the Head of the Universal Church had deemed him worthy and capable of so great a task by reason of some personal endowment. It was much more like the Saint to *exaggerate*, if I may say so, his own incompetency, in order that all the greater glory might be given to God.

A similar argument drawn from the silence of the "Epistle against Coroticus" scarcely deserves a serious reply. This Epistle was directed against a Welsh chieftain, who, though nominally a Christian, was leading a life of wanton piracy and plunder, murdering and despoiling the Saint's Christian neophytes. St. Patrick having denounced the excesses of this renegade appeals to his own Apostolic power of binding and loosing by excomunicating the offender. Surely there was here no call for a reference to his Roman mission, which was simply taken for granted.

Other Irish records, which, because of what they do *not* say, are adduced as proof that St. Patrick did not receive his commission from the Holy See, are the Hymns of *St. Sechnall*, *St. Fiacc's* metrical life of St. Patrick, and the tract by *Muirchu-Maccu-Mactheni*, in the Book of Armagh. As regards the hymn of St. Sechnall, it is to be noted that the reading of the third stanza is doubtful. The word "Petrus" occurring in that stanza might be "Petrum." If we read "Petrus"—and it appears to be the reading of the best MSS., such as the "Leabhar Breac," the Dublin MS. of the "Book of Hymns," and a famous Roman MS.,—then this stanza declares St. Patrick to be, "constant in the faith as Peter, upon whom the Church is built, *and of whose apostolate he was made partaker by God*, against whom the powers of hell cannot prevail." This reading offers as explicit a reference to a commission from the See of Peter as could be expected in a poem of the kind. But, waiving the advantage which the somewhat doubtful text offers, we need only once more appeal to the natural scope of these writings of St. Sechnall or St. Fiacc. Neither of them meant to write exhaustive biographies of our national Apostle. The long and important period of about forty years, between the end of St. Patrick's captivity and the beginning of the Irish

Apostolate, St. Fiacc sums up in *thirty-three words.* Surely in so meagre a sketch it was natural to omit all reference to such facts as a commission from the Holy See. The silence of St. Sechnall (if we are to admit his absolute silence) is satisfactorily accounted for in a similar manner. He is, as the opening words of his poem state, the panegyrist, not the biographer of his beloved master. And what he says is comprised in less than a hundred lines, which hardly permit a reference to such details as the Saint's apostolic commission, much less do they call for its mention.

As to the argument drawn from the apparent silence of Mactheni, we may be brief.

It is well known that a considerable portion of that valuable tract has most unaccountably disappeared, within the last two hundred years; and indeed there is sufficient evidence to show that the lost portion contained an account of the Roman mission. For why should Ussher, so evidently bigoted in his references to St. Patrick's Catholic standpoint, admit that the Roman mission of St. Patrick is unanimously attested by the historians of the Saint's life? The inference is plain: he could not have done otherwise, for Mactheni's tract was still intact in his day.

In fact the titles of the lost chapters have been happily preserved. One of them is "De aetate ejus (Patricii) quando *iens videre Sedem Apostolicam* voluit discere sapientiam." We strongly suspect that if this chapter had not so mysteriously vanished, our adversaries should have to look elsewere for evidence against St. Patrick's Roman mission. No one who approaches the critical study of Patrician literature without bias doubts that the Life of St. Patrick known as that of Probus, is simply a revised version of Mactheni's text. And Probus bears very explicit testimony to the Roman mission; hence we have at least a strong presumption, that similar testimony was contained in that ever-to-be-regretted lost chapter of Mactheni.

The chief positive argument against St. Patrick's Roman mission has been drawn from Dr. Todd's "corrected" chronology. The learned doctor, in his once famous "Memoir of St. Patrick," set out to show that the Saint could not have reached our shores before the year 440, and therefore could not have had a commission from Pope Celestine, who died in 432. In support of his

theory, Dr. Todd puts forth a number of arguments, involving an intricate process of arithmetic and based upon some doubtful passages in certain old Irish records. These arguments have been completely refuted by Cardinal Moran, who shows that the old records to which Dr. Todd refers do in reality reckon St. Patrick's apostolate from the year 432. A similar attempt to extort a proof against the Saint's apostolic mission from the text of the Epistle to Coroticus, was ably answered by Dr. Gargan, of Maynooth, who demonstrated that the view maintained by the best authorities on Irish history, such as Ussher, Ware, Colgan, O'Curry, Petrie, had not met with any honest or critical refutation. This view was consistently supported by all the old records, the book of Armagh, the Leabhar Breac, the Cronicum Scotorum, the Annals of Ulster, the Annals of Innisfallen, the Four Masters, Marianus Scotus, together with the existing biographies of the Saint. All these agree so well about the date as to force from Dr. Todd himself the statement which he seeks to subvert, that "The Irish annals *with singular unanimity* give A. D. 432 as the date of his consecration and arrival as Bishop of Ireland." It must then be admitted as a fact attested as clearly as any in our history, that Christianity was introduced into Ireland directly from Rome, the fountainhead of Catholic orthodoxy.

It would be easy to quote copiously from the writings of the early Irish Saints and chroniclers, to show the sentiments of devoted loyalty and filial reverence entertained by the early Irish Christians towards the Apostolic See. There are numerous Irish hymns which illustrate the thoughts and feelings of the people in reference to the prerogative of St. Peter and his illustrious successors; we still possess many old archives in Ireland holding canonical enactments of the early Irish Church, regarding the authority of the Roman See; there are records of numerous pilgrimages undertaken by Irish saints, in the spirit of filial attachment, to the chair of the Vicar of Christ.

But these evidences we must leave aside for the present, in order to meet other arguments of recent date by which an attempt is made to show that "Popery" is a comparatively late importation into Ireland. Wilde in his "Boyne and Blackwater" maintains that Ireland first fell under the sway of Rome at the Council

of Cashel in the days of Henry the Second; and Dean Murray, of Ardagh, in his "Ireland and her Church" credits Gerald Barry with being one of the first to introduce "Romanism" into Ireland. This "Anglo-Norman theory" has been asserted so confidently, and repeated so often, that it has gained some credit.

It is acknowledged from clear and existing records that long before Irish soil echoed to the martial tread of Strongbow and his steel-clad Norman knights, there were *Papal Legates* in the country. Thus we find Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, appointed in 1110; Malachy, Bishop of Down, appointed in 1140, and Christian, Bishop of Lismore, appointed in 1151. History tells us how these prelates, in their capacity as Papal Legates, enjoyed supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Irish Church. They exercised disciplinary authority throughout the country, they presided at Synods, they took precedence of all dignitaries, even of the Archbishop of Armagh. Surely these facts are irreconcilable with Ireland's rejection of Papal supremacy previous to the Norman invasion. But we have a still more striking instance of the exercise of Papal authority. The famous Synod of Kells was held in the year 1152, twenty years before the Invasion; and it was presided over by Cardinal Paparo, a Papal Legate, sent direct from the Eternal City. The records of this Synod state that the four Irish Archbishops received from the hands of the Cardinal Legate the *Pallium*, which was the distinctive badge of obedience to the Roman See. Need I go any further to prove that the recognition of Papal supremacy in the Irish Church was not due to the Anglo-Norman invasion?

It may be objected that if the Anglo-Normans were not literally the first to bring the Irish Church under the sway of the Roman Pontiff, that event is still largely attributable to them, inasmuch as their rulers actually put on a lasting basis the uncertain authority which Papal ambition and Papal intrigue had a short time previously established.

But then, I ask, who may assert that the Papal authority was uncertain before the Norman invasion? There exists a rather famous Bull of Adrian IV. I do not here forget that there is or was tedious controversy regarding its authenticity. For even if that Bull were a forgery (which I do not admit), it would still

bear witness to the fact that when King Henry felt the power of the Irish chieftains becoming too strong for him, he sought to overcome their opposition by arming his representatives in Ireland with this Bull (true or alleged) of Adrian IV, wherein the Pope is represented as handing over the Islands to Henry, and entrusting to him the Reformation of the Irish Church. The King's act would have had little meaning, if it did not imply that Ireland was already a most obedient and faithful daughter of the Apostolic See.

But why multiply arguments? Were the Norman Kings of England so loyal to the Pope as to show themselves really willing to extend his spiritual rule? Was not the reign of Henry himself one long struggle against the rights of the Church and the Holy See, culminating in the murder of St. Thomas à Becket in his own Cathedral, for his intrepid and unflinching defence of those rights against the tyrant's encroachments? Must not the same be said of King John, who struggled againt the prerogatives of the Church down to the closing years of his reign; when he was at length forced to come to his knees, and own himself the vassal of the Roman Pontiff? Pretty apostles these, forsooth, of "Romanism" in Ireland!

Even if the Norman rulers had been as loyal to the Holy See as Charlemagne or Louis IX, it may be safely asserted that they would have been quite incapable of changing the religious convictions of the Irish people from the Protestantism which is claimed for them to an enthusiastic obedience and love for the Roman See. There existed, as is well known, then and for centuries after, an implacable animosity towards the foreign Sassenach and the native "Irish enemies"; and if England during the last three hundred years, with unlimited power in Ireland, has been incapable of forcing Protestantism on the people, we might fairly suppose that she was unable during the Norman times to force Papal supremacy on them.

The year 1152 is often quoted as the date of the rise of the Papal authority in Ireland. Dr. Mant, Bishop of Down and Connor, in his work "The Church of Ireland," roundly asserts, that the Synod of Kells held in that year is the first instance of Papal usurpation to be found in the history of the Irish Church.

According to him, the Archbishop of Armagh enjoyed up to that date supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Ireland, appointing to bishoprics, presiding at Synods, and recognizing no superior on earth. He arraigns St. Malachy, who, he says, was ambitious to have the Pallium, for having brought the independent Irish Church under the Papal yoke; and the learned critic of Irish history is quite exercised at "the fatal collation of the Archiepiscopal Palls" in 1152.

It is singular enough that, if Dr. Mant be correct, there should never have been uttered a word of protest by the independent Irish bishops, against this unwarranted usurpation of St. Malachy and the Roman See. We know that they strenuously exerted themselves, only a century earlier, to resist the encroachments of Canterbury. Are we then to believe that they were ready to bow at this time their necks, without a struggle, to a strange yoke? Are we to suppose that the Archbishop of Armagh, the hitherto independent head of the Irish Church, as our opponents suppose him to have been, wanted a master, or that it was possible to deliver over the Irish hierarchy, without the trace of a struggle, as subjects to a Roman Bishop whom they had never before recognized as superior to themselves? The supposition is on the face of it absurd. Dr. Mant is misled by the apparent fact that previous to the year 1152, the Pope had never had cause to interfere in the appointment of Irish Bishops, and that up to that date the Irish Bishops had not received the Pallium. But this is no argument for the historian.

If it be true that there are but few traces to be found in the annals of Irish Church history, to show that the Pope interfered in the government of Ireland before St. Malachy's time, there are abundant reasons to account for the fact. In the first place, the distance of Ireland from Rome necessarily limited the communication between the two countries. There were no steamships, railways, postal or telegraph systems available. The route lay between half-civilized countries, often at war, and travel was beset with difficulties. Under such circumstances it must seem quite natural that St. Celestine should have invested St. Patrick with plenary powers in matters pertaining to the appointing of bishops and abbots, the convocation of synods, the passing of disciplinary

enactments for the government of the local churches. It is a rather good testimony to the fidelity of the people, and also to the efficiency of their bishops and priests, that there should have been no occasion which obliged them to have unnecessary recourse to Rome.

But there are other arguments which, however briefly summed up, I must defer to another instalment of this survey of the position which the Irish Church has from its very beginning held toward the Mother Church of Rome.

(To be continued.)

JAMES J. MCNAMEE.

St. Macarthen's Seminary,
Monaghan, Ireland.

CARENTIA OVARIORUM VEL UTERI NUM OBSTET MULIERIS MATRIMONIO.

IN fasciculis mensis Dec. anni praeterlapsi et hujus anni mensis Januar. disputatum est de impedimento impotentiae matrimonium dirimenti, quo late se extendat ad defectus ex parte feminae exsistentes: utrum scilicet carentia ovariorum impedimentum matrimonii dirimens constituat, an habenda sit pro sola sterilitate quae valorem matrimonii non afficiat.

Hac in re, ut fasciculi quos dixi demonstrant, nova exorta est controversia, allis affirmantibus exsistere impedimentum dirimens, negantibus aliis. Cujus controversiae occasionem imprimis dedit libellus Romae conscriptus et editus, cui titulus "Jos. Antonelli, sac. *De conceptu impotentiae et sterilitatis relate ad matrimonium.*" Auctor enim omnino tenet, illam carentiam vere constituere impotentiam neque ab ejusmodi femina quae defectu isto laboret, matrimonium valide iniri posse. Contra quam sententiam imprimis cl. Eschbach, rector Seminarii Gallici in Urbe, in libellis periodicis qui inscribuntur *Analecta Ecclesiastica* opposuit sententiam, quae in ejusmodi defectu non impotentiam sed sterilitatem tantum agnovit.[1]

Neque illa controversia restringitur ad defectum nativum, sed

[1] *Anal. Eccl.*, X, pp. 85, 135, 225, 313, 466, 494, sqq.

comprehendit etiam defectum arte inductum, videlicet de iis feminis etiam agit, quae excisionem ovariorum per manus chirurgi subierunt; neque de solis ovariis deficientibus vel excisis agit, sed etiam de *utero* deficiente vel *exciso*.

Difficultas in hac quaestione solvenda imprimis est theoretica: quam libellus ille ab Antonelli conscriptus pertractat. Verum accedit difficultas practica, quid videlicet permittendum, quid interdicendum sit iis feminis quae defectu isto laborent. Neque res adeo rara tangitur; nam satis frequentes nostra aetate sunt mulieres, quae istam excisionem sive uteri, sive ovariorum, sive excisionem utramque variis ex causis subierint. Dicam pauca (1) de theoretica difficultate, (2) de difficultate practica.

I.

Quoad priorem difficultatem *urgens* ratio, cur illa ovariorum et uteri carentia videatur constituere impotentiam atque impedimentum matrimonii dirimens, ea est quod per eam essentialis matrimonii finis evadat impossibilis.

Nimirum: Matrimonium institutum est ad conservationem et propagationem generis humani seu filiorum generationem. Et quamquam ipsa filiorum generatio non est necessaria et essentialis, videtur tamen plane ad essentiam matrimonii pertinere, ut mutuum jus tradatur ad actus generandae proli aptos. At in carentia ovariorum vel uteri actus generandae proli apti sunt prorsus impossibiles: deest enim elementum necessarium a muliere subministrandum, vel ovum humanum, vel via qua ovum reddi possit fecundum. Ad impossibilia autem jus dare vel dare velle absurdum est. Ergo *essentia* matrimonii videtur deficere, ac proin exsistere impedimentum matrimonii dirimens.

Accedit explicatio *S. Alphonsi*, qui ex communi auctorum sententia discrimen inter sterilitatem et impotentiam sic explicat lib. 6, n. 1096: "Impotentia est illa propter quam conjuges non possunt copulam habere per se aptam ad generationem; unde sicut validum est matrimonium inter eos qui possunt copulari, esto *per accidens* nequeant generare, puta quia steriles aut senes, vel quia femina semen non retinet, ita nullum est matrimonium inter eos qui nequeant consumare eo actu, quo ex se esset possibilis generatio." Et quamquam S. D. haec l. c. applicat ad defec-

tum viri, tamen eadem videtur esse ratio, quando propter defectum feminae actus, *ex quo ex se generatio possibilis sit*, haberi nequit.

Nihilominus ipsa S. Doctoris verba in se continent, quod contra hoc argumentum possit opponi. Validum matrimonium eorum dicit, qui sunt steriles vel senes. At revera continua et constans est praxis Ecclesiae, a primordiis servata, ut benedicat etiam matrimonia eorum, qui in senili aetate volunt contrahere, eaque matrimonia pro validis habeat, si modo vir et femina inter se copulari possint. Verum, si feminam senilis aetatis respicimus (nam de viro loqui necesse non est), a vetula praestari ea amplius non possunt, quae ad generandam prolem essentialiter pertinent. Ovaria ejus, utpote exsiccata, officio fungi nullatenus possunt, neque ovulum amplius maturare et dimittere valent; ergo deest primarium elementum ad generandam prolem necessarium. Hinc ejus conditio plane eadem est atque illius feminae quae ovariis caret.

Dicunt quidem aetatem, in qua femina ita deficiat, non posse exacte definiri, neque deesse exempla earum, quae in summa aetate etiam prolem genuerint. At licet non accurate eadem aetas quascumque feminas reddat steriles, est tamen aetas ultra quam communiter vis generandi non perduret; et si rarissimae exceptiones fuerint, hae, maxime si agatur de matrimonio *contrahendo*, probari deberent, si vis generandi deberet mansisse intacta, ut matrimonium ineundum valeret. Ecclesia autem nunquam erat sollicita in tali probatione exigenda, sed etiam in iis casibus, in quibus vel praesumptio vel ipsa certitudo exstinctae generandi facultatis adest, senum matrimonia semper permisit.

Unde qui vim generandi in muliere deficientem non agnoscunt pro impotentia, sed pro sterilitate matrimonii valorem non derimente, essentiam matrimonii ejusque finem essentialem aliter debent definire. Dicunt igitur, finem quidem primarium esse filiorum generationem, attamen secundarium finem eumque ad essentiam matrimonii sufficientem esse, ut sit remedium concupiscentiae. Quapropter matrimonium consistere posse validum, si modo copula complete haberi possit, quae apta sit ad completam satisfactionem utrique praestandam; hanc quidem ex se ex ordinarie contingentibus etiam aptam esse ad generandam prolem, at si propter defectum accidentalem ille finis generandae prolis non attingatur

neque possit attingi, propterea tamen matrimonium non exsistere nullum.

Quae si vera sint, jam patet eos qui defendunt carentiam ovariorum non constituere impotentiam matrimonii dirimentem, posse cum fundamento non levi insistere in similitudine cum matrimonio senum. Et si semel admittitur, vim generandi ad valorem matrimonii in femina non esse necessariam, facile est gressum facere ad casum de carentia uteri: videlicet neque hunc defectum, quum non impediat copulam perfectam ex parte viri neque satisfactionem mulieris, esse impedimentum matrimonii dirimens.

Ex iis igitur, quae dicta sunt, concludi poterit: de sententia, quae mulierem ovariis et utero per excisionem orbatam matrimonii contrahendi inhabilem habeat, jam conclamatum esse. Verum qui ita ex analogia cum matrimonio senum concluderet, praepropere ageret. Nam res in eo differunt, ut quando sermo est de excisione ovariorum vel uteri, aliquid *positive actum sit* contra primarium matrimonii finem; quando de matrimonio senum, *nihil actum sit* contra hunc finem sed naturali conditioni humanae omnia relinquantur. Quantopere autem alterum ab altero differat relate ad matrimonii nullitatem efficiendam vel non efficiendam, patet ex effectu conditionum in pactum matrimoniale inductarum: quae si positive aliquid agendum statuant contra primarium matrimonii finem, matrimonium reddant nullum, alias illud per se relinquant validum.

Quare puto, quaestionem propositam, utrum excisio ovariorum vel uteri constituat impedimentum dirimens necne, theoretice nondum esse plane solutam. Verum estne quaestio haec practice soluta?

II.

Practicam solutionem videmur accipere posse ex responsis S. Officii, quae tum die 3 Februarii 1887 tum postea die 30 Julii 1890 data sunt. Praestat haec denuo oculis subjicere. Ut *Analecta Eccl.*, X, p. 497 referunt responsa sunt haec:

1. Sub die 3 Februarii 1887 ad QUAESITUM: "Num mulier, per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum sterilis effecta, ad matrimonium ineundum permitti *valeat* et *liceat*, necne?" S. OFFICIUM R. "Re mature diuque perpensa, matrimonium mulieris, de qua in casu, non esse impediendum."

2. Die 30 Julii 1890. S. OFFICIUM sequentes litteras dedit ad Ep. Regiensem:

"*Illme ac Rme Domine:—*

"In Congregatione feria iv diei 23 currentis mensis discussum est dubium ab Amplitudine Tua propositum supplici libello diei Octobris elapsi anni, videlicet:

"Num mulier *N. N.* cui operatione chirurgica ablata sunt duo ovaria et uterus admitti possit ad matrimonium contrahendum? Et re mature perpensa, Emi. DD. Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores Generales decreverunt: *Matrimonium non esse impediendum.*

"Quod cum Amplitudini Tuae pro istius Curiae norma significo, Eidem fausta quaeque adprecor a Domino.

"Amplitudinis Tuae
addictissimus in Domino
"R. *Card.* MONACO."

Romae, die 30 Julii 1890.

Quorum responsorum vis et efficacia perpendenda est, ut cognoscamus, quid pro solutione quaestionis nostrae generali inde deduci possit, quid non possit.

Excederet utique in aestimanda vi et efficacia horum responsorum, qui concluderet, rem esse plene absolutam atque irrevocabiliter definitam. Nam ut ipsius S. Officii decretis illam vim attribuere possimus, necesse est, ut sint vere decreta doctrinalia omnes Christifideles spectantia, et ut sint a R. Pontifice confirmata, idque non in forma communi sed in forma specifica. Quorum nihil obtinet in nostra re. Decreta quae attulimus, sunt decisiones *particulares* in singularibus causis datae, neque per se vel directe doctrinales sunt, neque prae se ferunt approbationem R. Pontificis, multo minus ejus approbationem specialem.

Operae pretium est referre, quod *Wernz*, Jus Decretal. t. ii, n. 659, ad eam rem scribit: "Sententiae judiciales etiam hujus supremae Congregationis [scil. S. Officii] jus tantum constituunt inter partes nec vim legum universalium habent. Decreta, quae de doctrina catholica fidei vel morum a S. C. Inquis. publicantur, etiamsi a R. Pontifice in forma *communi* fuerint confirmata, magnam sane habent auctoritatem, sed ex sese irreformabilia non sunt, nisi a R. Pontifice per confirmationem in forma *specifica*

datum in veras definitiones *R. Pontificis* ex cathedra loquentis transmutentur. Utrum decreta vel instructiones S. C. Inq. vim legum universalium habeant, an ordinationes tantum particulares contineant, ex ipso tenore verborum, inscriptione, forma approbationis et promulgationis est eruendum."

Si haec applicamus ad decreta supra allata, evidens est, eas non esse leges universales, multo minus irreformabiles, sed esse decisiones et injunctiones particulares quamquam nituntur in aliqua legis naturalis vel divinae interpretatione.

A vero igitur aberrant, mea sententia, illi, qui decreta S. Officii supra allata habeant pro suprema legis naturalis vel divinae interpretatione doctrinali, quae ab omnibus qui eam noverint pro norma haberi *debeat*. *Debebant* decisionem pro norma habere Curiae illae episcopales, ad quas decisio data est, idque in iis causis quae erant ad S. Officium delatae.

At altera quaestio est, num *possint* decisiones illae pro norma haberi *ubique*.

Wernz alio loco, vid. t. i, n. 196, non apprime quidem ad rem nostram, tamen in re simili dicit: "Decreta particularia SS. CC., quae interpretationem juris communis dubii et obscuri . . . continent, sane magnam habent auctoritatem et non solum ut interpretationes doctrinales, sed etiam tamquam vere authenticae personas obligant, quibus data sunt; attamen supremum gradum auctoritatis, *i. e.*, legum universalium non attingunt, nisi universae Ecclesiae legitime promulgentur aut iteratis declarationibus transeant in stylum Curiae aut in praxim et disciplinam communiter vigentem."

Ut pressius loquar de nostris decretis, S. Officium sane *censebat*, excisionem ovariorum et uteri non obstare liceitati ineundi matrimonii; nisi enim id censuisset, non potuisset in casu particulari mulieri licentiam dare. Ejusmodi *practicum* judicium de liceitate rei quae conceditur, non supponit necessario veritatem rei ejusque certitudinem, neque hanc adesse S. Officium suis decretis declaravit. Summum aliquis dicere poterit, Cardinalibus qui S. Officii munus gerebant, *persuasum fuisse* de rei veritate, scil. quod carentia ovariorum et uteri impedimentum matrimonii dirimens non constituat. Sed haec persuasio etsi adfuerit, quum in infallibilitate non nitatur, errori *potest* esse obnoxia.

Verum necesse non est, ut Cardinales *cum certitudine* judicarent abesse impedimentum dirimens. Sufficit, ut judicaverint id esse *satis probabile*. Nam si satis probabile est, impedimentum dirimens non exsistere, non constat, a muliere fieri rem lege divina et naturali prohibitam, si matrimonium ineat eoque utatur; quod si non constat, licebit ei matrimonium inire. Gravissimi theologi in ipsis supremis R. Pontificis decisionibus, quae non doctrinam aliquam definiant, docent, posse Romanum Pontificem secundum probabilis juris sui interpretationem procedere: multo magis teneri debet, sufficere probabilem interpretationem juris seu legis, ut S. Officio liceat responsum et decisionem particularem dare.

Id unum igitur ex decretis S. Officii allatis *certo* concludi potest, S. Officium habuisse pro probabili legis divinae et naturalis interpretatione, excisionem ovariorum et uteri in muliere non constituere impedimentum matrimonii dirimens. Hoc autem *sufficit*, ut inde securam sumere possimus normam practicam. Si enim S. Officium id habuit pro probabili, quis dixerit, id *non esse probabile*. Certe S. Officium, ut ipsum testatur, rem mature discussit. Quando autem doctissimi viri rem adeo mature consideraverunt, temerarium esset dicere, non adesse rationes internas graves quae suadeant id quod illi demum concluserunt. Immo sola hujus supremi tribunalis auctoritas tanta est, ut necesse non sit in rationes inquirere, sed ut ex mera auctoritate exsistat sententia probabilis et practice tuta.

Utut igitur liceat, theoretice contrariam opinionem defendere, atque accitis rationibus conatum in id dirigere, ut S. Offici sententia in posterum feratur contraria: quamdiu id factum non fuerit, cuilibet, cujus interest, licebit sequi opinionem, quam S. Officium in suis decisionibus judicabat esse sive veram sive practice probabilem; neque quempiam, qui eam opinionem sequi velit, licebit mea sententia impedire.

Ergo, ut breviter dicam, decreta S. Officii id effecerunt, ut mulier, cui excisa sunt ovaria et uterus, ab ineundo matrimonio impediri non possit, nisi Roma sententiam contrariam edixerit.

Quae conclusio practica ut magis eluceat, ad eas difficultates etiam respondendum est, quae a rigidioris opinionis patronis possunt moveri. Tota haec difficultas in eo sita est, quod S. Officium rationes sui responsi dare non soleat nec dederit, rationes

autem esse possint pro singularibus istis causis propositis *peculiares*, quae non subsint communiter: quod si ita sit, decisio illa particularis sumitur perperam pro norma generali seu communi. Et revera contendunt non solum severioris opinionis sectatores, sed etiam alii ex alio fine, non constare casus propositos egisse de excisione *totali;* verum nisi hoc sit, vim generandi in muliere re ipsa non esse plene sublatam, sufficere enim reliquias ovarii, ut demum sequi possit conceptio prolis, sufficere etiam relictam esse uteri partem, ut conceptio saltem ectopica non evaserit impossibilis. Quum igitur hae fuerint fortasse conditiones mulierum, de quibus egerit sententia S. Officii, nihil sequi videri poterit pro liceitate et valore matrimonii ejus mulieris, quae *totalem* excisionem passa sit.

Attamen, ut his difficultatibus respondeam, concedo quidem, Sacras Congregationes Romanas non reddere responsi sui rationes; sed noto, ea nihilominus vera esse debere quae in ipsis responsis edicuntur. In responso autem priore die 3 Febr. 1887 expresse agitur de muliere, quae per utriusque ovarii excisionem *sterilis sit effecta;* clarum igitur est, S. Officium respicere eum casum, in quo generatio propter excisionem evaserit impossibilis.

In posteriore casu sermo est de muliere, cui ovaria *et uterus sint oblata.* Quod nemo dixerit de operatione, quae partem tantum uteri abscindat. Sed si uterus vel maxima ejus pars exciditur, etsi ovaria manserint intacta (quod saepissime non ita est: nam saepe cum utero simul extirpantur ovaria), tamen communicatio ovarii cum utero occluditur, atque hac ratione ovi fecundatio prolisque conceptio redditur impossibilis. Quare etiam in hoc posteriore S. Officii responso Emi Cardinales ex eo profecti sunt, quod habuerint mulierem generandi vi omnino destitutam. Ergo re vera S. Officii responsa pro communi norma sumi possunt in casibus similibus.

Id vero certum est, talem mulierem, si matrimonium inire vult, debere virum cui nubere velit conditionem suam docere; alioquin in re gravissima ille decipitur, eo quod a spe posteritatis plane dejiciatur.

Postremo tangi debet difficultas practica. Si enim responsa S. Officii in re nostra pro norma generali sumuntur, videntur multorum peccatorum praeberi ansa et incitamentum. Multae mulieres conceptionem prolis abhorrent. Si igitur post ablatam generandi

vim nihilominus matrimonium inire possint, tentationem incurrunt (eique non raro cessurae sunt) istam operationem subeundi, eo fine, ne in matrimonio matres fiant.

Cui difficultati respondeo: (1) Abusus in plerisque rebus et juribus non est impossibilis factus; per hanc possibilitatem res ipsae vel jura non mutantur. (2) S. Officium quidem non loquitur de muliere, quae volens ex inhonesto fine incisionem subiit. Attamen ex quacumque causa demum defectus ille inductus fuerit, mulieris conditio circa aptitudinem ad matrimonium *eadem* est. Quapropter sive ex necessitate curandi morbi sive ex libero fine malo chirurgica ista operatio facta fuerit: censeo non constare de impedimento matrimonii dirimenti. Peccat gravissime femina, quae ex mero arbitrio vel ex intentione fruendi matrimonio sine onere ex maternitate oriundo operationem faciendam curat, peccat medicus, qui vel rogatus tali intentioni obsecundat, quum sola necessitas salvandae vitae vel gravis curandi morbi ratio esse possit, ex qua liceat istam mutilationem sive subire sive facere: verum postquam facta fuerit, lege naturali matrimonium non prohibetur, eo quod impedimentum dirimens non exsistat vel saltem de eo non constet. (3) Ecclesia utique potestate potitur statuendi impedimenti. Si igitur opportunum judicaverit, statuere poterit, ut vel omnis operatio chirurgica, qua mulieris ovaria vel uterus excidantur, vel ejusmodi operatio temere facta subsequens matrimonium dirimat. Quod si fecerit, res erit confecta. Sed quamdiu hoc non fecerit, aliis jus non erit matrimonium mulieris per excisionem ovariorum vel uteri sterilis effectae impedire.

AUG. LEHMKUHL, S.J.

Valkenbergi Hollandiae
in Collegio S. Ignatii.

Analecta.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER

Of Our Holy Father

LEO XIII

To the Bishops of Italy.

Venerable Brethren: Health and Apostolic Benediction:

Fixing Our mind on the serious condition of society, We have not been slow to recognize, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, that one of the gravest duties of Our Apostolic charge was to watch in a most special manner over the formation of the clergy. We understood, in effect, that every project of Ours to restore the Christian spirit amongst the people would be vain, unless the ecclesiastical body preserved entire and vigorous the priestly spirit. Hence, We have not ceased to provide therefore according to Our power, as well by suitable institutions as by many documents, all tending to the same end.

At the present moment, Venerable Brethren, a special solicitude for the clergy of Italy induces Us to touch once more upon a subject of such great importance. It is true, indeed, that the clergy afford

splendid and constant proofs of learning, piety and zeal, amongst which it pleases us to recall with praise their ardor to coöperate with the bishops in the direction of the Catholic movement, which is so dear to Us.

We cannot, however, hide the anxiety which we feel at seeing insinuating itself here and there, for some time past, a spirit of ill considered innovation, concerning, not only the formation, but also the manifold action of the ministers of religion. It is even now easy to foresee what serious consequences we should have to deplore, if to such novel tendencies a suitable remedy were not applied. In order to preserve the Italian clergy from the pernicious influences of the times, We consider it opportune, Venerable Brethren, to recall in Our present Letter the true and changeless principles which should regulate ecclesiastical education and the sacred ministry.

Divine in its origin, supernatural in its being, immutable in character, the Catholic priesthood is not an institution which may be accommodated to the inconstancy of opinions and the systems of men. A sharing of the Eternal Priesthood of Jesus Christ, it must perpetuate, even unto the consummation of ages, the same mission which the Divine Father confided to His Incarnate Son: "As the Father sent Me, so I send you."[1] To effect the eternal salvation of souls is the great mandate which it may never fail to obey; just as, in order to accomplish this faithfully, it must never cease to have recourse to those remedies, those Divine rules of thought and action, which Jesus Christ gave when He sent His Apostles through the entire world, to convert the nations to the Gospel. Hence it is that St. Paul repeats, in his Epistles, that the priest is not other than the *ambassador*, the *minister of Christ*, the *dispenser of His mysteries;*[2] and represents him as raised to the position of intermediary between heaven and earth,[3] to treat with God concerning the supreme interests of the human race, which are those of the life eternal. Such is the conception which the Sacred Books exhibit of the Christian priesthood; a supernatural institution, superior to all others on earth, and entirely separated from them as the Divine is from the human.

The same lofty ideal stands out clearly from the writings of the Fathers, the teaching of the Roman Pontiffs and the Bishops, the decrees of Councils, the unanimous conviction of the Doctors and

[1] St. John 20: 21.
[2] II Cor. 5: 20; 6: 4; I Cor. 4: 1.
[3] Hebrew 5: 1.

Catholic Schoolmen. Nay, the unbroken tradition of the Church proclaims with one voice, that the priest is *another Christ*, and that the priesthood, *although exercised on earth, appertains in truth to the celestial hierarchy;*[4] *because to him is entrusted the administration of things altogether heavenly, and a power is conferred upon him which God has not conferred even upon the angels*[5]—a power and a ministry which regard the government of souls, or *the art of arts.*[6] Therefore have the education, the studies, the moral formation, in a word, all that appertains to ecclesiastical discipline, been ever considered as something consistent and complete in itself, not only distinct, but entirely separated from the ordinary standards of the life of laymen.

This distinction and separation must, then, remain in our day, and all tendencies to blend or confound ecclessiastical education and manner of life with the education and life of the laity are condemned, not only by the tradition of our Christian past, but by Apostolic teaching and the commandments of Jesus Christ.

Undoubtedly, in the formation of the clergy and in the priestly ministry, reason insists that we take into account the diversity of times. In consequence, We are far from disapproving of those changes which render the work of the clergy more efficacious amidst the society in which they live. It is precisely for this reason that We have deemed it fitting to foster amongst ecclesiastics a culture more solid and more perfect, and to open for this ministry a more extended field; but every other innovation that would cause injury to the essential character of the priesthood must be considered altogether blameworthy. Above all things, the priest is constituted the teacher, physician and shepherd of souls, and guides them to an end which is beyond the limits of the present life. He can never correspond fully with functions so noble, unless he be versed as deeply as he should be in the science of things holy and Divine, unless he be abundantly endowed with that piety which makes him a man of God, unless he employ all his efforts to confirm his teaching by the power of example, according to the warning given to the spiritual pastors by the Prince of the Apostles: "Being made a pattern of the flock from the heart."[7] Whatever changes the times and the conditions of society undergo, those are the proper and supreme qualities which, according

[4] S. J. Chrysos., *De Sacerd.*, Lib. III, n. 4.
[5] *Ib.*, n. 5.
[6] S. Greg. M., *Reg. Past.*, Par. i, C. 1.
[7] I Peter 5: 3.

to the principles of faith, should be resplendent in the Catholic priest. All other endowments, natural and human, are commendable, it is true; but, in relation with the priestly office, they will have an importance only secondary and relative. If, then, it is reasonable and just, that, within lawful limits, the clergy should accommodate themselves to the needs of the present age, it is, similarly, just and necessary, that, far from yielding to the dangerous current of the time, they should resist it with vigor. This conduct corresponds with the lofty purpose of the priesthood, and, by increase of dignity and respect, renders its ministry more fruitful. It is only too well known how the spirit of naturalism tends to corrupt the social body, even in the healthiest places; the spirit which puffs up the souls of men and prompts them to revolt against all authority; which degrades human hearts and turns them to seek things which decay, oblivious of those which endure forever. It is much to be feared that the influence of this spirit, so injurious and already so far diffused, may insinuate itself amongst ecclesiastics, especially those of less experience. Its disastrous consequences would be the lessening of that gravity of conduct which the priest so greatly needs, easy concessions to the charm of every novelty, pretentious indocility towards superiors, neglect of that gravity and moderation in discussion which are so necessary, particularly in matters of faith and morals. But an effect far more deplorable, because linked with prejudice to the Christian world, would ensue in the sacred ministry of the word, into which would be introduced a language incompatible with the character of the herald of the Gospel.

Moved by such considerations We feel obliged to recommend anew and with greater earnestness, that, above all things, the seminaries be maintained, with zealous solicitude, in their proper spirit, as well in what concerns the education of the mind as in what concerns that of the heart. It must never be forgotten that their exclusive purpose is to prepare young men, not for human functions, howsoever legitimate and honorable they may be, but for the exalted mission which We have indicated, of *ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God.*[8] According to this ideal, altogether supernatural, it will be ever easy, as We have remarked in the Encyclical to the clergy of France in September, 1899, to trace the precious standards, not only for the true formation of clerics, but also for the averting

[8] 1 Cor. 4: 1.

from educational establishments all peril in the way of religion or morality.

As to studies, since the clergy may not ignore the progress made in any branch of useful knowledge, let them accept whatever is recognized as sound and helpful in the new methods; for each epoch contributes something to the growth of human thought. We wish, however, that in this regard the directions be carefully recalled which We have given concerning the study of classical literature, and especially the study of philosophy, theology, and the analogous sciences; directions which We have set forth in several documents, but particularly in the Encyclical of which We transmit you a copy with this Our present Letter.

It is certainly desirable that all young ecclesiastics may always be able, as they should be, to make their course of studies in the shelter of sacred institutions. But since grave reasons counsel that at times some of them should frequent the public universities, let it not be forgotten with what and how great precautions the bishops should allow them to do so.[9]

For the sublime object of preparing worthy ministers of God it is necessary, Venerable Brethren, to employ with an ever increasing vigor and vigilance, besides scientific methods, the disciplinary and educational organization of your seminaries. Let only those young men be admitted who offer solid hopes of a purpose to consecrate themselves forever to the ecclesiastical ministry. Let them avoid contact and community of abode with young men who do not aspire to the priesthood. This manner of living in community with them may be tolerated for a time for just and grave reasons and with special precautions, as long as young ecclesiastics cannot be recruited according to the spirit of their proper training. Let those be sent away who during the course of their studies manifest tendencies little in accordance with the priestly calling; and in admitting clerics to sacred orders let the greatest care be employed according to the weighty warning of St. Paul to Timothy, "Impose not hands lightly upon any man."

In all this it is fitting that every other consideration be esteemed as secondary; every other must be deemed inferior to the most important of all considerations, that of the dignity of the sacred ministry.

Then, in order to form in the students of the sanctuary a living

[9] Instr. *Perspectum*, S. Congr. EE. RR. 21 July, 1896.

image of Jesus Christ, it is a matter of great consequence for that formation which is the crown of all ecclesiastical education, that the directors and teachers join to diligence and the experience of their functions the example of a truly sacerdotal life. The exemplary conduct of those who exercise authority, especially over young men, is the most eloquent language and the most persuasive to inspire them with the sense of their own obligations and the love of good. A work so important demands, especially of the spiritual director, a prudence far beyond the ordinary, and a never-wearied care; and such a function as his and of which We wish to see no seminary deprived, calls for an ecclesiastic greatly experienced in the ways of Christian perfection. We cannot recommend him urgently enough to spread and cultivate amongst the students, in the most lasting manner, piety, profitable for all, but of inestimable value for the clergy. Let him also forearm them against the dangerous mistake, common enough amongst the young, when they allow themselves to be carried away by the ardor of study, to the point of neglecting, in consequence, their progress in the science of the Saints. The more deeply piety sinks its roots in the souls of ecclesiastics, the more capable will they be of that powerful spirit of sacrifice, absolutely necessary to labor for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

Thank God, there are not wanting in the Italian clergy priests who give noble proofs of what is possible to a minister of God penetrated with this spirit. Admirable is the generosity of a great number, who, to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, run with ardor to distant lands, regardless of fatigue, privations, and sufferings of all kinds, and even of martyrdom.

Thus, surrounded by tender and vigilant care, in a fitting culture of spirit and talent, the young levite will gradually become such as the holiness of his calling and the needs of the Christian people require. The apprenticeship is long indeed; it must be continued even beyond the days of the seminary. In effect, young priests may not be left without guides in their first labors; they have need to be sustained by the experience of men more capable, whose zeal, and piety, and prudence, have grown mature. It is similarly useful to form the custom of keeping them continually in touch with sacred studies, either by academic exercises or by conferences at fixed intervals.

It is evident, Venerable Brethren, that the recommendations which We have hitherto made, far from being a hindrance in any way, are, on the contrary, most useful for that social activity of the clergy which

We have so often encourged as a need of our times. As a faithful observance of the rules which We have recalled require, it is necessary to safeguard that which must be the life and soul of this activity. Let Us repeat it again and more emphatically: it is necessary that the clergy go to the Christian people, who are exposed on every side to snares and false promises, and urged, especially by socialism, to apostasy from their hereditary faith. But all priests must subordinate their action to *those whom the Holy Ghost has placed as Bishops to rule the Church of God*, without which confusion and grave disorder would ensue to the prejudice of the cause which they have to defend and promote. We desire, furthermore, in pursuance of this purpose, that at the end of their seminary course the aspirants to the priesthood shall receive instruction in the Pontifical documents which concern the social question and Christian democracy, while abstaining, however, as We have said above, from outward work. Then, having become priests, let them sedulously labor for the people, who are always the object of the most affectionate solicitude of the Church. To save the children of the people from ignorance of spiritual and eternal things, and with industrious tenderness to guide them towards an honorable and virtuous life; to confirm the adults in the faith, and, while dissipating contrary prejudices, to urge them to the observance of the Christian life; to promote amongst the Catholic laity those institutions which have been recognized as truly beneficial for the moral and material betterment of the masses; above all, to defend the principles of Evangelical justice and charity, by which all the rights and duties of civil society are justly harmonized—this is, in its great outlines, the noble task of priestly social action. But let him always remember that in the midst of the people he must preserve entire his august character of minister of God, being set at the head of his brethren *chiefly for the sake of souls*. Every manner of working for the people at the expense of priestly dignity, and to the prejudice of ecclesiastical duty and discipline, deserves only severe reprobation.

Such, Venerable Brethren, is what the consciousness of the Apostolic charge urged Us to speak, considering the actual situation of the clergy in Italy. We have no doubt that, in a matter so grave and so important, you will unite with Our solicitude the most active and the most devoted efforts of your zeal, being inspired particularly by the luminous example of the great Archbishop, St. Charles Borromeo.

Wherefore, to ensure the effect of Our present regulations, you will be careful to make them the subject of your local conferences, and to

agree upon such practical measures as, according to the needs of each diocese, will appear opportune. The support of Our authority will not, if necessary, be lacking to your projects and deliberations.

And now, with a word which springs spontaneously from the bottom of Our paternal heart, We turn to you all, priests of Italy, recommending that each and every one exert his utmost care to correspond ever more worthily with the proper spirit of your eminent vocation. To you, ministers of God, We say with more reason than St. Paul said to the simple faithful, "I, therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called."[10] May the love of the Church, our common Mother, solidify and purify the harmony of thought and action which redoubles power and renders work more fruitful. In times so hurtful to religion and society, when the clergy of all nations must unite themselves more closely for the defence of Christian faith and morality, it behooves you, well-beloved sons, united to the Apostolic See by special bonds, it behooves you to give the example to all others, and to be the first in absolute obedience to the voice and orders of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Thus will the blessings of God descend abundantly, as We implore, in order that the clergy of Italy may remain always worthy of their glorious traditions.

Meanwhile, as a pledge of Divine favors, receive the Apostolic Blessing which We now accord, with effusion of heart, to you, Venerable Brothers, and to all the clergy whose guardians you are.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, December 8, 1902, in the twenty-fifth year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII, Pope.

PONTIFICAL LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE HIERARCHY, CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

LEO XIII.

For a Perpetual Remembrance.

The broad stretch of islands bounded by the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean which Philip II, King of Spain, called the Philip-

[10] Ephes. 4 : 1.

pines, were scarcely opened up by Ferdinand Magellan at the beginning of the sixteenth century when, with the image of the Holy Cross planted on their shores, they were consecrated to God and offered as a first fruit offering of the Catholic religion.

From that time the Roman Pontiffs, with the aid of Charles V and Philip his son, both remarkable for their zeal for spreading the faith, have thought nothing more urgent than to convert the islanders, who were idol worshippers, to the faith of Christ. With God's help, by the strenuous efforts of the members of different religious orders, this came about very favorably and in such a short time that Gregory XIII decided to appoint a Bishop for the growing Church there, and constituted Manila an Episcopal See. With this happy beginning the growth which followed in after years corresponded in every way. Owing to the united measures of our predecessors and of the Spanish kings, slavery was abolished, the inhabitants were trained in the ways of civilization by the study of arts and letters, so that the people and Church in the Philippines were deservedly distinguished by the renown of their nation and their meritorious zeal for religion. In this way, under the direction of the kings of Spain and the patronage of the Roman Pontiffs, Catholicity was maintained with due order in the Philippine Islands. But the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters there has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for every one rights which are safe and unassailable.

To provide against the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this new state of affairs a plan of action and of organization had to be sought promptly and with great care. For this purpose we sent our venerable Brother Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, as our Delegate Extraordinary to the Philippine Islands, who, after examining in person and putting to rights whatever would not admit of delay or postponement, was then to report to us. The duties thus imposed he has discharged faithfully in our behalf, and deserves for this reason that we should bestow on him well-merited praise. Later it happened auspiciously that the government of the United States of America undertook, by means of a special legation, to consider plans for a way of adjusting certain questions regarding Catholic interests in the Philippines. This enterprise we gladly encouraged, and by the skill and moderation of the negotiators a way has been opened for a settlement, which is to be effected on the ground itself. After hearing

the opinions of some of the Holy Roman and Eminent Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation presiding over Extraordinary Affairs, we decree and declare in this Apostolical Constitution what has seemed, after long deliberation, to be most conducive for the interests of the Church in the Philippine Islands, trusting that what we, by our supreme authority ordain, may, with the civil government righteously and favorably disposed, be zealously and piously observed.

I.—On the New Boundaries of Dioceses.

First of all, therefore, it is our intention and purpose to increase the sacred hierarchy. When the diocese of Manila had been created by Gregory XIII, as we have said, as the faithful rapidly increased in numbers, both by reason of the natives who embraced the Catholic religion and of the arrivals from Europe, Clement VIII decided to increase the number of bishops. He therefore elevated the Church in Manila to the dignity of an Archiepiscopate, making the Bishops of the three new dioceses he created, Cebú, Caceres and Neo Segovia, suffragans to it. To these was added later, in the year 1865, the Episcopal See of Jaro.

Now these dioceses are so vast that, owing to the distance by which the settlements are separated and the difficulties of travel, the bishops can scarcely visit them thoroughly without extreme labor. Wherefore it is necessary to avail ourselves of the present opportunity to reduce the diocese already established to narrower limits, and to form new ones. Hence, keeping the Archiepiscopal See of Manila, and the dioceses of Cebú, Caceres, Neo Segovia, and Jaro, we add to them and create four new dioceses: Lipa, Tuguegarao, Capiz, and Zamboanga, all, like the others, suffragans to the Manilan Metropolis. Moreover, in the Marian Islands, we create a Prefecture Apostolic, subject, without any intermediate authority, to ourselves and to our successors.

II.—The Metropolitan and His Suffragan Bishops.

The Archbishop of Manila is the one who will bear the title of "Metropolitan" in the Philippine Islands; and all the other bishops, those who fill the old as well as those who are to occupy the newly created sees, will be subject to him, as suffragans both in rank and in name. The rights and the functions of the Metropolitan are laid down by the ecclesiastical laws already extant. As we wish that these laws

be inviolably observed, so also do we wish that the bonds of holy friendship and charity between the Metropolitan and his suffragans be ever unimpaired, and grow always closer and more binding by mutual services, exchange of counsel, and especially by frequent episcopal conventions, so far as distance may permit. Concord is the mother and guardian of the greatest benefits.

III.—The Metropolitan and Suffragan Chapters.

The dignity and precedence of the Metropolitan Church require that it should be honored by a College of Canons. The Delegate Apostolic will see and determine how to obtain in future the stipend for each of the Canons, which hitherto was paid by the Spanish government. If, owing to the shrinkage of revenue, the number of Canons cannot be maintained as heretofore, let it be reduced so as to consist of ten at least, and retain those who are Canons by right of their office. The Archbishop may by his own unrestricted right confer the aforementioned dignities, the Canonry, and all the benefices which belong to the Metropolitan Church; except, indeed, those which either by common law are reserved to the Apostolic See, or are the gift of some other person, or are controlled by the conditions of the concursus. We earnestly desire to have colleges of canons formed in the other Cathedral churches also. Until such time as this can be done, the bishops are to choose for consultors some priests, secular and religious, distinguished by their piety, learning and experience in administration, as is done in other dioceses in which there is no canonical chapter. To provide for the proper dignity of the sacred ceremonies, the consultors, just mentioned, should attend the bishop when officiating. If for any reason they be prevented from so doing, the bishop will substitute others, worthy members of the clergy, both secular and religious.

IV.—Vacant Suffragan Sees.

Should it happen that any suffragan diocese, in which there is no canonical chapter, should lose its bishop, the Metropolitan will assume its administration; should there be none, the charge will fall to the nearest bishop, with the condition, however, that a vicar be chosen as soon as possible. Meanwhile the vicar-general of the deceased bishop will manage the diocese.

V.—The Secular Clergy.

Since it is proved by experience that a native clergy is most useful everywhere, the bishops must make it their care to increase the number of native priests, in such a manner, however, as to form them thoroughly in piety and character, and to make sure that they are worthy to be entrusted with ecclesiastical charges.

Let them gradually appoint to the more responsible positions those whom practical experience will prove to be more efficient. Above all things the clergy should hold to the rule that they are not to allow themselves to be mixed up in party strifes. Although it is a maxim of common law that he who fights for God should not be involved in worldly pursuits, we deem it necessary that men in holy orders in the present condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands should avoid this in a special manner. Moreover, since there is great power in harmony of sentiment for accomplishing every great useful work for the sake of religion, let all the priests, whether secular or religious, cultivate it most zealously. It is certainly proper that they who are one body of the one head, Christ, should not envy one another, but be of one will, loving one another with brotherly charity. To foster this charity and maintain a vigorous discipline the bishops are reminded how very useful it is to convene a synod occasionally as time and place may require. In this way there will easily be unity in thought and action. To keep the first fervor of the priests from cooling and to preserve and increase the virtues which are worthy of the priesthood, the practice of the spiritual exercises is most helpful. The bishops must therefore see that all who have been called to the vineyard of the Lord should at least every third year go into retreat in some suitable place to meditate on the eternal truths, to remove the stains contracted by worldly contamination and renew their ecclesiastical spirit. Effort must be made to have the study of the sacred sciences kept alive among the clergy by frequent exercise: "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge," by which he can teach the faithful, "who shall seek the law at his mouth."[1] For this purpose there is nothing better than to have conferences frequently, both on moral and on liturgical questions. If the difficulties of travelling, or the small number of priests, or any other similar cause, prevents them from meeting for such discussions, it will be well to have those who cannot attend the conference, treat in writing the

[1] Malachy 2 : 7.

questions proposed and submit them to the bishop at the appointed time.

VI.—THE SEMINARIES.

How much the Church thinks of seminaries for the young men who are educated with a view to the priesthood, is clear from the decree of the Council of Trent, by which they were first instituted. The bishops should, therefore, make the most diligent effort to have one in each diocese, in which young candidates for the sacred warfare may be received and trained for a holy living and in the lower and higher sciences. It is advisable that the boys who are studying literature should occupy their own building, and the young men who, after finishing the humanities, are devoted to philosophy and theology should dwell in another. In both departments the students should remain until, if deserving, they shall have been ordained priests, and never be permitted, except for grave reasons, to return to their homes. The bishop will entrust the administration of the seminary to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his prudence and experience in governing and for holiness of life. The rules laid down by us and by our Predecessors show very clearly in what way the studies are to be regulated in seminaries. Where there is no seminary, the bishop will have candidates educated in one of the seminaries of the neighboring diocese. On no account should the bishops admit to these seminaries any but the young men who are likely to give themselves to God in holy orders. Those who wish to study for the civil professions should have other schools, if it be possible, known as episcopal institutions or colleges. Above all things the bishop, following the precept of the Apostle, is not lightly to lay hands on anyone; but to raise to orders and to employ in sacred things only those who, when well tried and duly advanced in science and virtue, can be of credit and of service to a diocese. They are not to leave those who go out from the seminary entirely to themselves; but to keep them from idleness, and from abandoning the study of the sacred sciences, it is an excellent thing to have them every year for at least five years after ordination submit to an examination in dogmatic and moral theology before men of learning and authority. Since the halls of Rome, also, are open to young students from the Philippines who may wish to pursue the higher studies, it will afford us much pleasure, if the bishops send hither from time to time young men who may one day communicate to their fellow-

citizens the knowledge of religion acquired in this very centre of truth. The Holy See will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in higher learning and better ecclesiastical training, so that in good time it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

VII.—The Religious Education of Youth and the Manila University.

It is not to the ecclesiastical seminaries only that the bishops are to devote their attention, the young laymen who go to other schools are also committed to their care and providence. It is, therefore, the duty of the consecrated bishops to make every effort that the minds of the young who are instructed in the public schools should not lack knowledge of their religion. To have it taught properly, the bishops must see and insist that the teachers are fitted for this task, and that the books in use contain no errors. Since there is question of public schools, we do not wish to proceed without a word of praise well deserved for the great Lyceum of Manila, founded by the Dominicans, and authorized by Innocent X. Since it has always been distinguished for sound doctrine and excellent teachers, for the great good it has accomplished, not only do we wish that it be treated with favor by all the bishops, but besides we take it under our own care and that of our successors. Wherefore confirming absolutely the privileges and honors granted to it by the Roman Pontiffs, Innocent X and Clement XII, we bestow upon it the title of Pontifical University, and wish that the academic degrees conferred by it, may have the same value as the degrees given by other Pontifical Universities.

VIII.—The Regulars.

Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region, the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity, and peaceful social intercourse. We recommend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offence to any man." We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish, therefore, that all should be bound by the

decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII, our predecessor, confirmed by Apostolic Letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, August 24, 1780. For the rest, the religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God; and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in future in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Formandis* of Benedict XII, dated November 6, 1744, and the other, *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

IX.—The Parishes.

The bishops will determine what parishes are to be entrusted to pastors from the Religious Orders after conferring with the superiors of these orders. Should any question arise in this matter which cannot be settled privately the case is to be referred to the Delegate Apostolic.

X.—The Missions.

To the other means by which the Church as teacher provides that faith and good morals and all that makes for the salvation of souls should suffer no harm, must be added one of the very greatest utility, the spiritual exercises commonly known as missions. It is altogether desirable, therefore, that in each province at least one house be founded as a dwelling for about eight religious men, whose one duty it will be to visit occasionally the towns and villages and better the people by pious exhortations. If this is so useful for the faithful, it is surely necessary for those who have not yet received the light of the Gospel. Wherever, therefore, uncivilized peoples are still buried in monstrous idolatry, the bishops and priests must know that they are bound to try to convert them. Let them, therefore, establish stations among them for priests who will act as their apostles, and not only

lead the idolaters to Christian practices, but also devote themselves to the instruction of the children. These stations are to be so located that in due time they may be made Prefectures or Vicariates Apostolic. To provide those who labor in them with means for support and for the propagation of the faith, we recommend that in each diocese, without interfering with the Lyons Society for the Propagation of the Faith, special congregations of men and women be formed to manage the collection of the alms of the faithful and hand over the contributions to the bishops, to be distributed entirely and equally to the missions.

XI.—Ecclesiastical Discipline.

To win the esteem of the faithful there is no better way than for the clergy to do in effect what as priests they preach. For, since, as the Council of Trent says, they are regarded as removed above worldly things to a higher plane, others lift their eyes to them for a model and imitate what they get from them. Wherefore it is highly proper that priests should so regulate all their manners that in their dress, carriage, walk, conversation, and in all things they may appear grave, moderate and altogether religious; they should avoid even lighter faults, which in them are serious, so that all their actions may inspire veneration. It is for this restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and for the full execution of this Constitution we have sent our Venerable Brother John Baptist Guidi, Archbishop of Stauropolis, as Extraordinary Delegate Apostolic to the Philippine Islands, carrying thither our Person. In him we have conferred all necessary faculties; and we have given him besides our mandate to convene and hold a provincial Synod, as soon as circumstances permit.

XII.—On Peace and Reverence for Those in Authority.

It remains for us now only to address ourselves with paternal charity to all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, and to exhort them with all the persuasion in our power to maintain union in the bonds of peace. This the duty of our Christian profession requires: "For greater is the brotherhood in Christ, than of blood; for the brotherhood of blood means only a likeness of body, but brotherhood in Christ is unanimity in heart and in soul, as it is written in Acts 4: 32, 'and the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.'" This, too, is required for the good of religion, which is the chief

source and ground of the praiseworthy things which have distinguished the Philippine peoples in the past. This, finally, is required by a sincere love of country, which will derive nothing but loss and destruction from public disturbance. Let them reverence those who exercise authority, according to the Apostle, "for all power is from God." And although separated from us by the broad expanse of ocean, let them know that they are one in faith with the Apostolic See, which embraces them with special affection and will never abandon its charge of protecting their interests.

E S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

CIRCA FACULTATEM ALIENANDI BONA ECCLESIASTICA PRO INSTITUTIS RELIGIOSIS VOTORUM SIMPLICIUM.

(MILWAUCHIENSIS.)

Illme et Revme Domine:

Pervenerunt ad me litterae ab Amplitudine Tua mihi datae die 14 elapsi mensis decembris, in quibus quaestiones fiunt circa facultatem alienandi bona ecclesiastica pro Institutis religiosis votorum simplicium.

Quoad primam quaestionem, utrum haec instituta sive virorum sive mulierum, sive a S. Sede approbata, sive tantum Dioecesana, indigeant, beneplacito Sedis Apostolicae pro alienatione suorum bonorum, responsio est affirmativa.

Relate vero ad alteram quaestionem, utrum Episcopi vi privilegii ipsis concessi circa alienationem bonorum Dioeceseos possint praedictis Congregationibus has alienationes permittere, responsio est, id posse Episcopis intra limites suae facultatis.

Tandem quoad imploratam sanationem pro alienationibus sine necessaria licentia bona fide peractis, Sacra Congregatio hujus modi sanationem et, si opus sit, etiam absolutionem a censuris transgressoribus concedit.

Interim Deum precor ut Te diu sospitet.

A. V. addictissimus Servus

FR. H. M. *Card.* GOTTI, *Praef.*

ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secret.*

RMO AC ILLO ARCHIEPISCOPO FRIDERICO KATZER.

(*Protocollo N. 52982.*) *Roma, 15 Gennaio 1903.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I. Letter of His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII, to the Bishops of Italy, on the Priesthood.

II. Apostolical Constitution addressed to the Hierarchy and the faithful in the Philippines in relation to the changed condition of ecclesiastical matters in the islands.

III. S. Congregation of the Propaganda addresses a letter to the Archbishop of Milwaukee concerning the right of alienating Church property on the part of Religious professing simple vows.

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

A short time ago a report was circulated through the press that the Roman Breviary was to be revised, and that corrected revisions, principally of the historical readings, would be substituted for the present *lectiones* in the nocturns. It was also said that the contemplated edition would be made obligatory only upon the newly ordained to sacred orders, whilst the rest of the clergy would be free to use the old editions with which priests are familiar. We may state authoritatively that this intelligence was simply conjectural and based upon the fact that the Holy Father had appointed a *commissio liturgico-historica*, consisting of Father Ehrle, S.J., and Mgr. Wilpert, both German priests resident in Rome, together with some other ecclesiastics, whose task it will be to carry out certain provisions regarding a revision of the Canonical Office proposed at the late Vatican Council.

We have on a former occasion spoken of this matter. It is conceded on all sides that there are in the present text of the Canonical Office certain defects which call for correction. If it be asked why these have ever been allowed to stand, and stand so

long as to have attained a certain authorization from the Church, we give the same answer that is made when there is a question of certain textual defects, errors of reading, of form, in the present versions of the Bible. Indeed a very large portion of the defects which need to be corrected in what may be called the priests' Prayer-Book, rests upon an erroneous reading of Scriptural versions, or upon an equally erroneous interpretation of certain texts by the early ecclesiastical writers. Other defects are recognized in a certain simplicity assuming as historical facts statements which, to the critical mind of modern times, convey the impression of credulity or unreasonable extension of that piety which courts faith where reason would suffice. To do away with these defects is likely to be a labor of many years, and anyone who recalls the work of former commissions appointed to a like task of emendation, will understand that the prospect of having a new Breviary different from the present *editio typica* of Fr. Pustet & Co. is far distant. At any rate, the idea of legislating on the subject of its actual introduction, before there has been a decision from the S. Congregation of Rites as to the adoption of any emendations in the Breviary, is on a level with pure newspaper gossip.

Some questions, however, of practical importance suggest themselves in speaking of this subject. First: Why is the emendation of the Breviary needed at all? Why did the Church tolerate a defective edition; nay, why did she make obligatory the very recitation of errors, by her authorizing an *editio typica* to which all printers and readers were obliged to conform under pain of censure? Does not this militate against her infallibility, or at least against her traditional wisdom? And, furthermore, there is the interesting question as to what are the things that should be emended? They are surely not typographical errors merely? And if there be errors of fact or of interpretation, how can the Church permit the change and tolerate a departure from the traditions which are bound up with her very teaching? It is an old saying and a true one, that the prayers of the Church embody her doctrine, and that therefore her liturgy, handed down from Apostolic days until now without change, testifies to her earliest teachings. Thus the form of her prayers becomes the rule

and the testimony of her faith—*forma orandi est lex credendi.* If this be true, how can the Church countenance, much less contemplate, any changes which since they involve years of active research by learned and wise men, must be something more than mere verbal alterations, translation, or construction? These are important questions, for, as a matter of fact, the changes needed are substantial. They will require the elimination of whole chapters which contain false statements of fact, erroneous interpretations of doctrinal precepts resting upon a false exegesis, and misplaced references to authorities that have no just claim for recognition. But this difficulty demands fuller treatment in a separate article.

"DEW-A-DIGON."

The title-page of a recently published volume by Monsignor John Vaughan,[1] bears, rather prominently in a scroll, beneath the author's name, the legend *Dew-a-Digon.* Several readers have asked us what is the significance of the phrase. The meaning of the words themselves is easily discoverable, since they are found not only in the Welsh language, but also in the Breton and the Celtic dialects generally, standing either for "God and enough," or, "God will also lead (provide)." That the former is the actual meaning which the phrase is intended here to convey we learn from Monsignor Vaughan himself. It is simply the motto found under the author's family crest; and he uses it for his publications, "so as to form a sort of connecting link between one and the other of his works." The Arabs have a similar expression, *Allah charîm,* meaning that God will take care of His creatures, and that therefore all anxiety for the morrow is to be set aside. Indeed, the phrase is Scriptural, and numerous paraphrases of it may be found in both Testaments. Hence, besides being a family motto, and what commercial people might call the author's trade-mark, the expression could be regarded as a happy selection embodying one of those pithy phrases which tell the gist and drift of a book's main contents or purpose. The words *Dew-a-Digon,* whether we accept the meaning of "God and enough," or that of "God will also provide," are thus simply a condensed form of a passage found in a Letter of St. Paul to the Hebrews (13: 5, 6), in which he

[1] *Earth to Heaven.* St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

exhorts them to be "contented with such things as you have, for He (God) hath said: I will not leave thee, nor will I forsake thee. So that we may confidently say: The Lord is my helper." In another Epistle (1 Tim. 6: 8) the Apostle expresses the same sentiment in similar paraphrase: "Godliness with contentment is great gain; having food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content." Thus without doing violence to the sense of Monsignor Vaughan's favorite motto, we may regard it as a sort of key to the teaching which he undertakes to popularize through his volume, *Earth to Heaven*, by leading our mind from our present and necessary condition of mortality to that for which we are destined in heaven, a task accomplished in that tranquillity of order which men call peace and contentment. But this is merely our own interpretation.

THE PHILIPPINE CONTROVERSY.

Some months ago we published an article on the subject of the Philippine controversy, which provoked much criticism from magazine and newspaper writers who were alive to the religious and economic interests involved. There had been a manifest inclination on the part of our Government officials to yield to the pressure of a prejudiced public opinion, which discredited Spanish rule, or rather the Friars who were supposed to represent that rule. Hence there was good reason why Catholics of influence should let their voices be heard, in order that our Government might be led into a complete and searching examination, so as to insure fair dealing to the Catholic subjects of the Islands. Those who were inclined to use their influence in this direction might indeed seem to abandon the attitude of respectful loyalty and, in their demand for justice, assume a position of aggressiveness. Such is, of course, the citizen's right; and in proportion as a government is swayed by the sense of equity or of policy, it would be lawful to appeal either to its representatives or to public opinion.

But whilst we avail ourselves of this right it must not be forgotten that in the case of legitimate government the ultimate verdict must come from the tribunal, the court of law, represented

by such government, and that we may not forestall it as unfavorable so long as there is evidence that the highest authority is disposed to correct past errors and to safeguard the rights of its citizens, whatever those rights may import in the estimation of the majority. We are bound, moreover, to the duty of respect for the persons, if not for their views and enactments, who represent the popular judgment. They are judges, and it is the rule in every court to keep this respect intact. If it is ever violated by those who yield only to secular control, it may never be violated with impunity by those who claim to be dutiful, for it is contempt of court to do so; and contempt of court is incompatible with defence of right, except in cases where revolution is legitimate on principles of right ethics.

This it is all the more important to remember when we stand forth as religious champions of religious freedom. That cause demands from us not only just respect for lawful actual authority, not only honesty and truthfulness in presenting our grievances, or in stating the injury done by those who violate the common rights, but also that prudence which dictates safe tactics in an important warfare. It may be objected that heroism is not always prudent; but then heroism is something very different from the bravado that merely wishes to attract attention or to cultivate profitable notoriety. We knew an old lawyer, able and respected, who gave this one parting lesson to his son, when he sent him to the pleader's bar: "Take infinite pains to get your facts, repeat them as often as they help you to point out a conclusion, but never *exaggerate* either the facts or their importance." It was a wise lesson, for if once your jury realizes the fact that you exaggerate in a single instance, they will discount all your statements in proportion, no matter how true they may be.

And this lesson we considered of grave importance in reference to the controversy on the Philippines, as it was carried on in behalf of the Friars. A good portion of the Catholic press seemed disposed to print anything that made against the Government and to extol the action of Catholics. If it was important that our demands should be heeded not only by the well disposed among the authorities, but by the public at large, it was equally important that we should make them on the ground of ascertained facts; or, if that

was not possible at once, upon principles recognized by law and equity which would allow no verdict until examination had been completed. To make appeals that might intimidate, but might not have a sound basis of proof, could not profit the Catholic cause. We have clear evidence of this in the question of the schools of our own children, wherein we do not even enjoy the public representation allowed for Catholics in Protestant countries such as England and Germany. Yet liberty is not talked of in those countries in the boastful strains which we hear in our land—even in our churches, whenever the patriotic wind blows in through the sacristy.

But this is hardly the occasion to repeat the old argument for wisdom as well as courage in warfare, however profitable it might be to do so. We said most of what we meant to say in the article referred to, which, although it aroused some sensitiveness, was properly understood and commended by many as a reasonable check to extravagant zeal.

With this issue, however, we are happy to do more than criticise. Our readers will be pleased to have a true version of the things effected by the investigation of Philippine affairs. The article by Dr. Middleton will aid the student of modern history and the citizen to understand many things that affect the rights of conscience and the important issues of religion, not only in the Philippines, but also at home. The statements of the eminent Augustinian are not conjectures; they are facts supported by documents of a legal character, and such as are likely to be recognized on both sides of the controversy. The following outlines of topics corresponding to the separate sections of the article will give an idea of the scope of Dr. Middleton's argument. After an introductory fixing the *status quaestionis*, the author reviews the Church statistics in the Philippines for the year 1898—Charges against the Philippine Reports—Genesis of these Charges—Mode of Procedure in the Commissions—Some Facts of Philippine Story—Preliminary Conclusions. The article is supplemented by an *Appendix* containing the following items: Interrogatories put to the Native Witnesses—Character of the Native Witnesses—Pueblo Schools—Law obliging Attendance—School-Course—Final Conclusions.

We have then here a defence of the Friars which is reasoned and just. That such a defence does not imply that there is nothing to be changed or corrected in the ecclesiastical sphere, is plain enough from the letter of our Holy Father, which we print in this issue from the excellent translation which *The Messenger* was the first to present to its readers.

The article is to be supplemented by further statistics from Spain and the Philippines which are being copied, and which will furnish a complete and searching survey of this very important subject.

SOME SUGGESTIONS REGARDING THE INSTRUCTION OF CONVERTS.

(By the Rev. Wm. I. Simmons.)

We are all familiar with the great care exercised, in the early Church, in the instruction and reception of converts. How they went through a long preparation of *audientes*, *genuflectentes*, *competentes;* how the mysteries of faith were gradually unfolded to them, until, after a lengthy probation, they were finally admitted to a full participation in the liturgy and the sacraments. But circumstances have changed since then. Those were pagan days. The general principles, at least, of Christianity pervade the world to-day, and the long period of probation is not necessary. But while there is no fear of a lapse into paganism, yet there is danger, with all the sophisms that are abroad, of a return to Protestantism, or of a seduction into agnosticism. And therefore there is need of having the neophyte well grounded and well instructed in the faith.

Although in certain details the instruction of a convert may differ in our age, yet in the general principles we cannot do better than learn of such great matsers as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Augustine. The former, in his *Instructions to the Catechumens*, gives us an explanation of the creed, prayer, and the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Eucharist, which, for simplicity and trenchant thought, has never been surpassed in modern times, and which is a lesson to us of the careful and thoughtful manner in which converts should be instructed. While St. Augustine's letters to the Deacon Deogratias on *Catechizing the*

Uninstructed treat of every phase, both of the manner of dealing with converts, and the matter for their instruction, and is well worthy a perusal by those who have converts to instruct.[1]

Taking this work of St. Augustine as a basis, let us consider some of the practical points in this important matter. And if sometimes we may appear to be putting forth our personal views, it is only that we are giving expression to the knowledge we have gained from those who have a larger experience and a deeper wisdom than ourselves—such masters in the art as Father Hecker, Father Hewitt, and their great disciple, Father Elliott.

In the first place our manner with inquirers should be kindness itself, joined to a spirit of cheerfulness. Very much depends on the reception inquirers get when they first meet a priest. It may seem very unreasonable to one who has always had the faith, but a very large proportion of inquirers are very timorous when they take the first steps toward entering the Church. If they have been well grounded in their own sect, it seems like disloyalty to their ancestors, like dishonor to their parents and those who have had charge of their religious training, to say nothing of the breaking of friendships and social ties which often follows. Consequently any brusqueness or severe handling may almost extinguish the spark of grace which has been enkindled within them. They should be received with a courtesy, a gentleness, and above all a frankness of manner which will reassure them and give them confidence. And in imparting instruction our earnestness of manner should impress the inquirer with the conviction that the Catholic Faith must be the true religion of Christ. There should be no lethargy, no lassitude, nothing to indicate that we are merely performing a duty; but, on the contrary, that we have the zeal of one who *believes* in what he is teaching and whose belief is so real that he wants to carry the light of conviction to others. This was the secret of the great force of Father Hecker, whether in preaching or conversing. At times, when under special mental strain, Fr. Hecker was afflicted with severe headaches. We have known him at such a time, when his head was all tied up and he could not leave his room,

[1] There is, also, a valuable chapter on "Converts" in Dr. Stang's *Pastoral Theology*.

on being told that there was someone who wanted to make inquiry about the Church, tear off his bandages, go down to the parlor and forget all about his headache.

The first thing to find out from an inquirer is, what led him to the Church. After satisfying him that he is not intruding, that we are most pleased to assist him in his inquiries, the question should be: "Why do you want to become a Catholic?" There are so many motives and so many circumstances leading to this act, that it is most important to learn this at the beginning. Some are attracted by the charm of her liturgy; others by the beauty of her doctrine; some who have been borne down by trouble and affliction, and have found no sustaining power in Protestantism; occasionally marriage is the motive. These last are the only ones to be mistrusted. Having found out the motive leading the inquirer towards the Church, the next step is to learn in what form of Protestantism he has been brought up. This will be a great help toward knowing how to deal with him.

Before commencing to instruct the inquirer, one of the most important things, which should never be omitted, is to tell him that we will explain everything about the Catholic Church, her doctrines and worship, and that at the end, if he wishes to become a Catholic, we will be glad to receive him into the Church; but if he should not be entirely convinced, he will be just as free as before he came to us. We must assure him that we shall not urge him, that there can be only one reason for his entering the Church, and that is the salvation of his own soul. Before entering on the instruction, the inquirer should be told to pray fervently for God to enlighten and direct him; especially to the Holy Ghost. Tell him to ask God, if the Catholic Church is the true Church, to give him the grace to realize it, and perhaps it is well to require some definite prayer, say, *e.g.*, the Our Father.

Having now arrived at the stage of instruction, the first question which arises is: How much time should be devoted to instruction?

We are well aware of the long period of probation required in the early centuries. We should certainly use equal care, according to the changed circumstances. No one should be received into the Church with less than from three to five months

of instruction and probation. We say *no one*. Of course occasionally we come across a person who has a thorough knowledge of the Church's teaching and even her worship. But these are rare exceptions. Ordinarily we should go through the Baltimore Catechism from beginning to end, and this cannot be done in less than from three to five months, according to the intelligence of the inquirer, with, say, two instructions a week. If he be not well instructed before reception into the Church, he may never become so, and a half-instructed convert is at a great disadvantage. Besides it is important to test the perseverance of the inquirer. If he attends regularly and keeps up his interest during that length of period, he will probably persevere after becoming a Catholic.

In giving the instruction, several points are to be observed. The inquirer should be required to learn the chapters in the Catechism on which the instruction is to be given, or at least to read them over carefully beforehand. The instruction should be in the simplest manner possible, without any pretence to superior knowledge. And it should be instruction pure and simple without any argumentation. Let the truths stand for themselves. Just as one would give instruction to children preparing for First Communion. Of course there must be variation in the instruction according to the intelligence and education of the inquirer, and for the uneducated we must illustrate with many examples and similitudes.

The inquirer should be encouraged to ask questions, and, if he be intelligent, to propound objections, and these should receive respectful consideration, no matter how foolish or how absurd they may be. If they are serious and historical questions, it is well to lend or to suggest the reading of such authors as treat of the subject.

The instruction should not end with doctrine, but should include the ordinary practices of devotion which are necessary for the life of grace. The convert should be taught the morning and night prayers; how to hear Mass; and of course also the *practical* part of the Sacrament of Penance. This is sometimes overlooked. It may under circumstances be prudent to warn converts against being too exacting in regard to the conduct of

those who have from childhood up enjoyed the blessings of faith, and in whom those who would carry our beautiful doctrine of grace to its most logical extreme, look for a corresponding sanctity of conduct. It is prudent, therefore, to explain to them the difference between the life of grace and the life of perfection, and, furthermore, that the gift of faith does not lift us out of the weaknesses of human nature. They will thus be prepared to find all kinds in the Church,—the good and the bad, the lukewarm and the fervent.

All this may imply a good deal of labor on the part of the priest, and if so much attention has to be given to a single convert it might be asked: "Is it worth the while?" We can only answer that if our Blessed Lord promised a reward to the one who should give a cup of cold water in His name, how much more will He reward His priest who gives the light of divine faith to one who was sitting in darkness and the shadow of death. Few of us but have our faults and imperfections, and it is opportunities of this kind that, perhaps, will appeal to the Master, who will say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: Thou didst instruct many to justice, thou shalt shine as a star for all eternity." (Matt. 25: 13; Dan. 12: 3.)

In the case of female inquirers much of this labor may be saved us by handing it over, if it can be done, to the Sisters, or some intelligent laywoman in the parish. Women understand, as a rule, the feminine mind and disposition better than we. All that remains for the priest to do is to make sure that the applicant has been properly instructed, and to supplement the examination by some further details on the doctrines of the Church, etc.

This paper might be deemed incomplete without a mention of certain books useful to inquirers and converts. In the first place, there is probably no book more useful to new converts than Bagshaw's *Threshold of the Catholic Church*. In it is contained much information of a practical nature, which it would take the ordinary convert months to become acquainted with. For the inquirers, of course, such books as: *The Faith of Our Fathers; Plain Facts;* for Episcopalian inquirers there is no better book than Stone's [Fr. Fidelis] *Invitation Heeded*. There are also many others: *Pepper and Salt, Clearing the Way*, and *The Question Box*, which

has just been published and made up from questions asked on missions, and will be found useful in giving answers, in a pithy form, to many questions which may trouble the neophyte.

Some priests keep a number of these cheaper books on the table of the office or reception room of the rectory, to be given to any stray caller who may happen along from time to time. By this means persons who only called on business, have occasionally been led into the Catholic fold. "He must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his ways, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." James 5 : 20.

THE "CARENTIA OVARIORUM" AS AN IMPEDIMENT OF MARRIAGE.

Those of our readers who have closely followed the discussion upon the above topic between the Rev. Dr. Casacca, O.S.A., of Villanova College, and Father Hild, C.SS.R., Professor of Moral Theology at the Ilchester Seminary, will be glad to see that (in the present number) the Jesuit Father Aug. Lehmkuhl, who, by reason of his works, is recognized both in America and in Europe as a leading scientific authority in matters of Moral Theology, has taken a hand in the dispute. As our veteran Jesuit contributor points out, the question is of an altogether practical character, and must therefore be answered upon practical lines. Theoretically there may be room for disputing the assumption that a union which owing to the absence of certain organs in the woman renders the marriage act unproductive, is nevertheless valid; but in view of the actual decisions of the S. Congregation in several cases submitted to its judgment, such a position cannot be maintained in practice. For, although the S. Congregation by its recorded decisions in individual cases does not pronounce upon all similar cases, thereby establishing an express law universally applicable, it nevertheless shows by the judgment given under definite circumstances what is the opinion by which the consultors were guided in their deliberation. Hence, although we may have no judicial decision, universally applicable, we have a judgment which permits a legitimate inference

as to other judgments in like circumstances. Such a judgment may indeed be reversed in future without prejudice to the tribunal claiming the right of adjusting its discipline to the requirements of time and place and persons, but it establishes a strong presumption regarding similar decisions. Now the S. Congregation has decided in particular cases that the absence of the *ovaria* and even of the *uterus* does not constitute either a permanent or a diriment impediment of marriage. Therefore we cannot in like cases maintain that it necessarily does so. Father Casacca did indeed endeavor to show that the cases upon which the S. Congregation pronounced were not such as to cover the whole question in principle, and therefore do not permit us to draw a conclusion applicable in general; but our Jesuit theologian goes into the analysis of the decisions and shows that they do not persmit a legitimate presumption of the existence of a diriment impediment at least until the S. Congregation declares the contrary.

The case then stands this way: A woman who is without ovaries, either by natural defect, or as a result of a surgical operation, may not be prevented from contracting marriage, provided she acquaint her intended husband beforehand with her condition. This latter provision is based on the natural right of a husband to desire and expect that his marriage will be blessed with offspring; he might therefore be unwilling to contract a marriage which deprives him of this expectation and fruit. Hence he must be warned beforehand against the error.

On the other hand, *theoretically* the subject is still open to discussion, since important reasons might arise why the S. Congregation should reverse its present judgment (as expressed in several specific cases). But until this is done, the confessor (respectively the matrimonial curia) is justified in deciding in favor of such marriages.

We should add that, after Father Casacca's answer to Father Hild's strictures of the former's contention, there would be due now a reply by our Redemptorist theologian; and Father Hild was actually prepared for this. Since, however, the article in this issue takes the view which Father Hild would defend, there may be no further necessity for discussion.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. The Code of Hammurabi.—Dr. Hugo Winckler[1] believes that the Code of Hammurabi is the most important document concerning Babylonian culture which has thus far been discovered. It was Fr. V. Scheil, O.P., the member for Assyriology attached to the French *Délégation en Perse*, who first published the text and a French translation of the curious inscription.[2] The find had been made in Susa, December, 1901–January, 1902. It is true that before Fr. Scheil's publication other legal documents, more or less contemporaneous with Hammurabi's Code, had been made accessible by Meissner,[3] Dr. Pinches,[4] Father Strassmaier,[5] and Father Scheil himself.[6] All these inscriptions, no doubt, will contribute their own little share to the proper understanding of Hammurabi's Code, and in their turn become the sharers in its light. But not one of the documents previously discovered can in any way claim to equal the systematic completeness of the latest find. It is on this account that Fr. Scheil's work has attracted already a great deal of attention; most probably, it will influence Old Testament study more vitally than did the Babylonian accounts of the creation and the flood. Among the proofs for the present interest in the question we may mention Dr. Pinches's paper read on November 12, 1902, before the Society of Biblical Archæology, Dr. Winckler's German translation of Father Scheil's French rendering,[7] Father Lagrange's article on the Code of Hammurabi,[8] and the "Notes on the Code of Ham-

[1] *Der Alte Orient*, iv, 4. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1902.

[2] Textes élamites-sémitiques, deuxième série, accompagnés de 20 planches hors texte, 4to, pp. 200. Paris: Leroux. 1902.

[3] Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht.

[4] Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets.

[5] Die altbabylonischen Verträge aus Warka.

[6] Une Saison des Fouilles a Sippar.

[7] *Der Alte Orient*, l. c.

[8] Revue biblique, January, 1903, p. 27 ff.

murabi" published by the Rev. C. H. W. Johns, Queen's College, Cambridge.[9]

The text of the inscription is chiseled on a splendid diorite, about 7 feet 2 inches in height, and from 5 feet 3 inches to a little over 6 feet in width. The front exhibits a representation of the sun-god dictating the law to Hammurabi, and, below this, sixteen lines of text, while the other side of the slab contains twenty-eight lines. Five lines of text have been erased, probably by the Elamites, when they transported the stone to Susa. Father Scheil in his translation divides the inscription into two hundred and eighty-two paragraphs, allowing the numbers between 66 and 99 for the lacuna. Father Lagrange arranges these paragraphs under the following headings: (1) unjust anathema against one's neighbor, pp. 1–2; (2) intimidation and corruption of witnesses, pp. 3–4; (3) injustice of judges, p. 5; (4) cases of theft, pp. 6–25; (5) military service and related questions of property, pp. 26–41; (6) cultivation of fields and orchards, pp. 42 ff.; (7) commerce, pp. 100–107; (8) liquor debts, pp. 108–111; (9) money express, p. 112; (10) relation of debtor to creditor, pp. 113–119; (11) deposits, pp. 120–126; (12) family life, marriage, engagement, heredity, pp. 127–184; (13) adoption, pp. 185–193; (14) bodily injuries, pp. 194–214; (15) on physicians, veterinary surgeons, and barbers, pp. 215–227; (16) on architects, builders, and ship captains, pp. 228–240; (17) letting of animals, pp. 241–249; (18) damage caused by animals, pp. 250–252; (19) hiring of men, animals, objects, pp. 253–277; (20) acquisition of slaves, pp. 278–282.

The foregoing sketch plainly shows that the Code of the Babylonian sun-god is of a civil rather than a religious character, and that even from a civil point of view it is not complete. Now, Hammurabi is generally identified with the king of Sennaar named Amraphel in Gen. 14; thus he becomes a contemporary of Abraham, though Dr. Winckler dates his reign about 2250 B. C. A comparison between the Babylonian and the Mosaic laws is therefore a subject of the highest interest and importance. The Rev. writer in the *Revue biblique* compares Ex. 21: 16, 37 and 22: 1–3 with the paragraphs of Hammurabi's law that refer to theft; similarly, he

[9] *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, January 1903, p. 96 ff.

compares Ex. 24: 4 and Lev. 19: 23 ff. with part of the Babylonian laws concerning the cultivation of fields and orchards; Rahab the harlot of Jericho as described in Jos. 2 furnishes a parallel to the Babylonian laws concerning liquor debts; Ex. 21: 2, 7 contains the Hebrew legislation corresponding to the part of Hammurabi's statutes on the relation between debtor and creditor; Ex. 21: 6 f. touches upon the question of deposits; Gen. 16: 6; 21: 10; Ex. 22: 15, 16 Lev. 20: 10; Num. 5: 11 ff.; Deut. 21: 15, 18 ff.; 22: 25, 28; 24: 1 ff. run parallel to the laws regulating the domestic affairs of the ancient Babylonians; Deut. 23: 17 bears on the question of adoption; Ex. 21: 15, 18–26; and Lev. 22: 19 f. consider the cases of bodily injuries; Ex. 21: 1 ff. reminds one of the Babylonian laws concerning barbers; Ex. 22: 9, 12, 14 is parallel to Hammurabi's enactments concerning the letting of animals; Ex. 21: 28 ff. resembles the Babylonian statute concerning damage caused by an animal.

On comparing these passages with the critical division of the Hexateuch, we see that Gen. 16: 6; Ex. 21: 1 ff., 6 f., 15 f., 18–26, 28 ff., 37; 22: 1–4, 9, 12, 14, 15 f. belong to the so-called Yahwist; Gen. 21: 10 belongs to the Elohist; Lev. 19: 23 ff.; 20: 10–12; 22: 19 f. are part of H or the Code of holiness; Deut. 21: 15, 18 ff.; 22: 25, 28; 23: 17; 24: 1 ff. belong to the Deuteronomist; Num. 5: 11 ff. belongs to P or the priest Code. Here, then, we seem to approach something like an archæological proof for the contention that in the Mosaic legislation we possess the record of a number of pre-Mosaic laws or customs written down by the Hebrew legislator, but modified or perhaps wholly abolished according to the needs of his own age. Again, we have another proof for the superiority of the Mosaic laws over those of Babylon from a humanitarian and moral point of view. It should also be noted that in Hammurabi's Code it is rather the supreme divinity than any particular god who inspires the Babylonian laws. But these are only a few of the many lines of study that meet in Hammurabi's Code as their proper centre.

2. Criticism of the New Testament.—During the course of last summer six popular lectures were delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, which are now published in book form.[10] The lec-

[10] Criticism of the New Testament, by W. Sanday, D.D., and others. London: Murray.

turers were Sanday, Kenyon, Burkitt, Chase, Headlam, J. H. Bernard. They treated of "the Criticism of the New Testament;" "Manuscripts;" "The Ancient Versions;" "The Canon;" "Dates of the Books;" and "The Historical Value of the Acts." We regret to state that the lectures contain a number of assertions which must appear extremely objectionable to the Catholic reader. Dr. Chase, *e.g.*, says that the Canon "was never the subject of any ordinance of a General Council;" again, he maintains, that the Books "do not all stand on the same level of certainty and authority;" he regards II Peter as of at least very questionable authenticity and canonicity. Dr. Bernard propounds a rather liberal view of inspiration: "we are," he says, "on insecure ground if we attempt to argue *a priori* from inspiration to inerrancy." But in spite of these drawbacks, the lectures, on the whole, are both up to date and conservative. Dr. Sanday, *e.g.*, accepts the position that the New Testament must be approached "like any other book." But while he is prepared to look the facts in the face as they are, he makes two reservations: First, the critics are to proceed more slowly, testing each step, on account of the importance of the subject; secondly, as the critics do not allow any assumptions in favor of Christianity, they ought not to make any assumptions against it. A document is therefore not to be put out of court, simply because it contains the account of a miracle.—We are glad to welcome the sixth edition of Mr. Hammond's little work "Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament."[11] Beginners will find it an excellent guide into the method and principles of textual criticism; it combines theory and practice in an especially clear and handy way.—The more advanced textual critic will find all the aid he needs in the work of Professor C. R. Gregory, the second volume of which[12] has now been published. The volume contains a repertory of the versions, a list of the ecclesiastical writers down to the twelfth century, and a list of authorities classified according to centuries and countries, thus furnishing a most handy book of reference.—*The Expositor*[13] gives first a criticism on Dr. Rendel Harris' con-

[11] Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[12] Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes; 8vo, pp. 514. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1902.

[13] November, 1902, p. 377 ff.

jectural emendation of I Peter 3 : 19, contributed by George Farmer; then Dr. Harris continues his former discussion, analyzing the amount of authority that ought to be granted to a conjectural emendation on which a number of critics happen to light independently.—We all remember the thorough defeat of the author of *Supernatural Religion* at the hands of Lightfoot; one can hardly understand how any writer has the hardihood of appearing again before the public after having been convicted of blunders without number. Lightfoot is dead, but, chameleon-like, the work of the anonymous author has appeared in a new form.[14] Of course, he believes that he has still something to say for himself and his peculiar views, and he endeavors to formulate his arguments so as to shield them against the force of Lightfoot's replies. But even at its best, the work can hardly be called a summary of rationalistic New Testament criticism. Both author and book belong to the past generation; our present critics have outgrown their spheres of thought.—Canon J. Armitage Robinson, of London, has just issued a little volume called *Study of the Gospels*, in which he endeavors to set forth in a popular but scholarly way the present methods and conclusions in studying these records of our Lord's life. The book endeavors to adhere to conservative principles; but Catholics can hardly agree with all the principles of the most conservative Protestants. Canon Robinson grants, *e.g.*, that the tradition concerning St. John's later life fully agrees with the phenomenon of the Gospel itself; in other words, the Gospel almost demands an author like the Apostle John such as he is in early Christian tradition. Can we therefore be sure of the historic accuracy of the Fourth Gospel. To expect that after such an interval, says the Rev. Canon, the evangelist's memory would reproduce the past with the exactness of dispatches written at the time, would be to postulate a miraculous interference; and we have no ground to suppose that the divine inspiration should so far disturb the normal condition of the human instrument. The contents of the Fourth Gospel are therefore an old man's recollections; yet, not merely such. They are rather the spiritual development of what the Apostle has heard and seen of his Master. The whole truth lies

[14] Watts. 6s. net.

in the great ideas of the prologue,[15] the rest is illustration. No need to say that such a defence of authenticity may preserve the shell, but it surrenders the kernel. Professor Fritz Hommel, of Munich, has contributed to *The Expository Times*,[16] an article entitled "The Logos in the Chaldæan Story of Creation." He endeavors to show that in the lists of primeval patriarchs, before man proper there appear two divine forms, namely Adam (= Alorus = Bab. Aruru) and Seth (= Alaparos = Bab. Adapada). Adapada or Seth is represented as corresponding to the Logos or the Memrā of the later tradition. Unless the reader is prepared to allow the cogency of arguments based on mythology, he will not be able to follow Professor Hommel in his elaborate deductions. Professor Schmiedel, of Zurich, devotes some interesting paragraphs to the question of the dependence of early Christian literature on Buddhism.[17] Schopenhauer's assertion that Jesus Himself depended on Buddha is dismissed as untenable. Nor do the oldest Gospels, namely, Mark and Matthew, exhibit traces of Buddhism. But, on the other hand, the Professor believes that the apocryphal gospels written between 150 and 700 A.D. certainly contain points of coincidence with the Buddhist gospels. He denies that these resemblances can be ascribed to mere accident. To prove his point, he advances three illustrations: (1) When the boy Buddha visited a temple, the brazen idols descended from their thrones and threw themselves at his feet; the legend concerning the Egyptian idol collapsing in the presence of the Infant Jesus is supposed to be a parallel to this. (2) The new-born Buddha is said to have looked all around him, and when he saw none like himself, to have taken seven steps to the north, saying: "I am the highest in the world." The apocryphal words of Jesus, addressed to His mother: "I . . . am Jesus, the Son of God, the Logos, as the angel Gabriel announced Me unto thee," are supposed to furnish the parallel of Buddha's words. (3) Both Buddha and Jesus, according to the apocryphal gospels, put their teachers to shame when they first went to school. But on considering the entire difference of relation between Buddha

[15] 1 : 1–18.

[16] Dec. 102, p. 1903 ff.

[17] Principal Problems in the Life of Jesus.

and the idols on the one hand, and Jesus and the idols on the other, one can hardly establish a parallelism between the incidents related under No. 1. Both the words and their setting of Buddha are so different from the words and their accompanying action of Jesus in Nos. 2 and 3, that no impartial critic will find more than an accidental agreement between them.—Mr. J. R. Wilkinson has published a pamplet[18] in which he has attempted to disentangle from the present text of the first chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke an earlier tradition concerning the birth of St. John the Baptist. Traces of this tradition are said to appear in St. Luke 1 : 5–25 and 57–66. It appears to be a narrative originally not connected with the history of the infancy of Christ. Mr. Wilkinson suggests that this tradition may have been handed down among the disciples of St. John, as distinct from the disciples of Jesus Christ. Since the third Evangelist himself testifies that he had recourse to various sources in order to write his Gospel with greater accuracy, the assumption of such a Johannean source does not in the least interfere with the dogma of the inspiration of the third Gospel.

3. Commentary.—Henry Bond, Borough Librarian, Woolwich, contributes to *The Expository Times*[19] a first instalment of an article on "The Best Bible Commentaries." The writer says that in his professional duties as librarian he has found the problem of pointing out the best commentaries on the different books of the Bible more difficult than the selection of the best books in any other department of knowledge. In consequence he had recourse to the device of sending out blanks with questions concerning the best scholarly and the best popular commentaries on each particular book of the Bible. The forms were sent to recognized theologians and scholars, and about sixty of them were returned with the information desired. The reader will find the list, as far as it is given in the present number of *The Expository Times*, most interesting and useful. We need not state that not a single Catholic commentary is named among the favored ones. In some future number, we may find space to print

[18] A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. Royal 8vo. 1902. 1s. 6d.

[19] Jan., 1903, p. 131 ff.

a similar list of commentaries that Catholics may have recourse to.—Bernhard Schäfer's series of Catholic commentaries has received a new accession in Dr. Paul Riessler's explanation of the Book of Daniel.[20] The reader is acquainted with the general characteristics of this series, viz., conciseness, clearness, and solidity. The present volume is not lacking in any of these qualities. In explaining the celebrated seventy weeks in Dan. 9, the author appears to favor the identification of the anointed prince with Cyrus, and of the predicted desolation with the downfall of Jerusalem under Antiochus IV. The beginning of the seventy weeks falls, therefore, in 605 B. C., the end of the seven weeks in 558 B. C., or the time of Cyrus; the end of the sixty-two weeks in 171 B. C. But the more common explanation is not positively excluded.

[20] *Das Buch Daniel.* Wien: Mayer & Co. 1902.

Criticisms and Notes.

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND HIS AGE. By Joseph McCabe. London: Duckworth & Co. 1902. Pp. x—441. Price, 6s. net.

A history of St. Augustine, written from a Pelagian standpoint, is a novelty, if nothing else. Mr. McCabe describes his work pretentiously as an "attempt to interpret the life of one of the most famous saints of the Christian Church, by the light of psychology rather than by that of theology." But he is constrained to add that he discards the 'perverse type' of biography followed by Augustine himself in his 'seductive *Confessions*'—a strange statement, considering his expressed predilection for psychological delineation of character of which perhaps no human document is so full as *The Confessions*—for a story told with a "saving tincture of Pelagianism." Were the great British heresiarch[1] of the fifth century to come to life to-day, he would see in the creed of naturalism embraced by Mr. McCabe the child of his own religious thought. For Mr. McCabe professes throughout his book an ostentatious regard and sympathy for Pelagian tenets, mixed with a tinge of lofty contempt for the narrow-minded opposition of Augustine, to whom he apostrophizes in the following delightful strain: "Probably [the Saint] little knew, when he began throwing stones, how fragile a house he had entered." "Alas for Augustine's '*vastissimum ingenium.*'"

"Pelagian," then, is the correct epithet to apply to this strange biography. The author claims to be an unbiassed historian, but his own strong religious prejudices get the better of his no doubt sincere intentions. In parts the book reads like an imitation of Gibbon. Elsewhere it suggests an immature effort of a prentice-hand. What are we to say of the equipments of a writer for the rôle of a serious historian who can express himself in such a schoolboyish fashion as this: "If Constantine had chanced to stake his fortune on Mithra instead of Jesus in his decisive battle, it is difficult to say what might have happened." "[Augustine's] real mental growth consisted in an accumulation of disjointed facts and thoughts, the formation of a treasury of knowledge which could be drawn upon in later years. . . .

[1] Mr. McCabe rejects the tradition that Pelagius was a monk of Bangor and his real name Morgan, as one based "solely on a late and unconvincing legend."

But he had no leading thoughts wherewith to order the storing of his harvest, and to his last days his erudition, such as it was, remained an uncritical and an undigested mass." "It is probable that Manicheism did no more than Christianity towards the purification of the empire"?

This irresponsibility of expression makes us sceptical about Mr. McCabe's pretensions to historical accuracy on points of fact. He thinks it "clear" that "the Africans had no notion whatever of Papal Supremacy," on the slender authority of what he has "said in connection with the Donatist controversy."[2] The Catholic student will prefer the well-weighed words of Cardinal Newman, who testified that it was the history of the Donatists of the fourth and fifth centuries that sounded in his ears the death-knell of his allegiance to a Church in rebellion against the Apostolic See. The "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" that settled for ever the claims of the Donatist schism to represent Catholicism also led the latter-day Augustine home to the divinely-appointed centre of unity.[3]

On a purely historical subject, such as the moral state of Rome at the time of its fall, we find the author quite as untrustworthy as a guide. He lays down the law with the *ipse dixit* dogmatism of a village schoolmaster. If Döllinger, Ozanam, and Villemain agree with contemporary writers like Ammianus, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, in painting in the darkest colors the corruption of dying Rome, it only shows to our superior "maker of history" that they are incapable of judging evidence, since they "shrink from a careful study of vice in any age." If it be objected that the educated world believes implicitly in the unutterable iniquity of Rome, and finds "no mystery in its fall," the answer is very simple—"*The world is wrong.*" It is puzzling to read after these flat denials of a position that is commonly thought to need no argument, that "the corruption of Rome, for several centuries dissolving the physical and moral vigor of the race, aided the process of destruction." The most charitable hypothesis to account for this *lacuna* (typical of many others) in our Pelagian historian's argument is that he has not sufficiently weighed his words or the thoughts that he wished to express by them.

[2] Yet he elsewhere admits that St. Augustine is strangely silent about the appeals to Rome in the case of Apiarius.

[3] Mr. McCabe discusses at length the question of St. Augustine and the Papal Claims in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1902, pp. 685-695, that might well have formed an Appendix to the present volume.

He shows wide reading on the literature of his subject—to take him at his own valuation, he is as familiar with the ponderous tomes of St. Augustine as with the Pagan eighteenth century, and recent writers on the period of his study—but it is another question whether he has properly digested the books which he has devoured. This suspicion makes the cautious reader more inclined to trust Mr. McCabe in his picturesque descriptions of men and things than in his superficial generalizations, rash dogmatizings, and profitless speculations.

The graphic account of Carthage, the "third city of the Empire," (built upon the ruins of the great seaport ruthlessly destroyed by Scipio in 146 B. C.) at the time of Augustine, from the scenic, the social, the philosophical, and the religious sides, shows a wide acquaintance with contemporary writers, Christian and Pagan. Procopius's *Secret Life* is adduced in support of his contention that the theatres in the early part of the fourth century were a veritable sink of iniquity. The author might, at this period, have alluded with advantage to the institution of Miracle Plays by the Christian Church in order to combat, by a rival attraction, the moral evils of the secular stage—an important point brought out by a recent writer in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.[4]

The moral atmosphere in which Augustine lived was on a par with the corruption of the drama. Salvianus, a priest of Marseilles, who looked upon the invasion of the barbarians as the divine punishment for the sins of the Empire in its decadence, declares, in words whose truth remains uncontradicted, that "Carthage was the cesspool of Africa, and Africa was the cesspool of the world." The same fact is apparent from St. Augustine's sermons to the Carthaginian Christians, who appear to have had only the most primitive conceptions of sexual morality.

Referring more particularly to Augustine's well-known moral lapse before his conversion, Mr. McCabe makes out a strong case for exaggeration on the subject in the *Confessions* written in later life.[5] The penitent Saint, looking back on youthful misdeeds through the haze of years which had changed the whole current of his thoughts, was the last man to spare himself from the reproaches of morbid self-introspection, or to weigh dispassionately the sins of his youth. If he

[4] See an article, by the Rev. W. R. Carson, on "Miracle Plays," in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1902.

[5] At an earlier period he waxes contemptuous at the "utterly false psychology and ethic" of the *Confessions* – a too sweeping statement that defeats its own end.

could speak in language that would not be too severe for a murder, in condemnation of a boyish theft of a few pears, he might equally distort the significance of other crimes. More insight is shown into the moral workings of Augustine's mind than into its religious development. The author has nothing but praise for the broad-minded position of Augustine the Manichean; he has scanty sympathy with the unwearying onslaughts against heretics by voice and pen of Augustine the Saint. With his customary desire to set contemporary authorities right, he maintains that the tenets of Manicheism have been "persistently misrepresented by Augustine's biographers." The purpose of his sneer is obscure since he goes on to admit that "it is likely that [Augustine] correctly describes, on the whole (*sic*), the Manicheism he embraced in the fourth century," and his own rhetorical account of the principles of the sect is no more than an extension of passages in the *Confessions*.

We have little quarrel with Mr. McCabe's analysis of the intellectual growth of Augustine's diverse beliefs. A study of "mathematics" in its three branches of arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, led him at Carthage, as a youth of eighteen, into his first religious *cul-de-sac* —a blind belief in the auguries of astrologers. The philosophical explanation of the existence and power of evil—that granite wall against which generations of religious thinkers have beaten their heads in vain—given by the Manichean system led him astray from the Catholic faith to accept a gross materialism. Dimly and gradually he came to see that God was in a higher world than that which the senses could comprehend. Through Plotinus and Plato he reached the Divine Christ. "Plato's doctrine of the Logos (borrowed from Moses, according to St. Justin) had, as it was presented by Plotinus, a singular resemblance to that of St. John. Plato's Trinity, as described by Plotinus, was sufficiently rational to recommend itself, and sufficiently Alexandrian to recommend the Nicene Creed." Neo-Platonic ideas concerning the spiritual nature of the imperishable realities—beauty, truth, goodness—severed one by one the links that bound him to Manicheism, until he found himself almost unconsciously safely landed in the "fair haven" of Catholicism. A Christian Platonist he remained to the end, and his long search after truth was rewarded by an abiding peace.

We gladly welcome Mr. McCabe's careful study of the phases of St. Augustine's mental development. We could wish that he had shown an equal sympathy with the Christian outlook of his subject.

He would then have spared himself the cheap sneer at the Saint's views on that virginity which he counted the dearest possession of the spouses of the Virgin-born; and the Catholic reader would not be irritated at would-be smart witticisms, that smack more of the infidel Gibbon than of an impartial historian, at the expense of the learning and charity of one of the greatest Doctors and Saints of the Universal Church, and at caustic criticisms, too obviously the result of a jaundiced mind to carry conviction. About Mr. McCabe's ability and powers of narration, as epigrammatic as they are fascinating—we would particularize the chapter on "The Dying of Paganism," and the description of the invasion of Numidia by the Vandals under Genseric, the Bismarck of the fifth century—there cannot well be question; we regret that we cannot say the same of his judicial temper as a trustworthy historian or of his powers of *spiritual* insight into the energizings and communings of the soul of a great Saint.[6]

THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D. With a Preface by the Right Reverend Handley C. G. Moule, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1902. Pp. xvi—278.

Protestant laymen cannot be fairly accused of apathy as regards theological questions. Anglican Church papers recently recorded the death of Sir William Roberts-Austen, an eminent scientist occupying an official position in the Royal Mint, who not merely built the unique wayside Italian church that forms so prominent a feature in the landscape of Blackheath in Surrey, but often preached from its pulpit; and now we have from the press a learned treatise in defence of the position assailed by Biblical High-Critics from the pen of Sir Robert Anderson, a well-known lawyer, at one time the head of the criminal investigation department of the detective headquarters at Scotland Yard, London.

Without any special training in theology, never, we suppose, in his life having sat on a hard bench under a lecturer on Scripture's chair, this typical man of the world (in the best sense) enters fearlessly into the arena to do battle with the Goliaths of European fame. It would be beside the mark to compare him to David, for he scouts

[6] We may add that, in spite of his assurance that he was "once the happy possessor of a theological microscope," he does not display a very keen theological scent, *e. g.*, in his persistent use of "Arian" and "Unitarian" as interchangeable terms.

such humble weapons as stone and sling, ranking himself without a qualm of embarrassment in a category superior to the most famous of the critics. The trained theological scholar who most sympathizes with his views will be provoked to smile when he reads that Sir Robert Anderson's previous work (little known outside a limited evangelical circle) under the title "David in the Critics' Den," has completely routed the Higher Criticism, and he will not thank him for the recapitulation of its arguments which, with sublime self-satisfaction, he gives in the present work as conclusive. This egotism runs throughout the book. The author assumes the Papal tiara and speaks *ex cathedrâ* on point after point of knotty controversy. In one place (p. 165) he settles conclusively a vexed question of Biblical chronology; in another (p. 149) he routs the critics on the narrative of Jonah; in a third (pp. 44, 149, etc.), he passes in review the Hebraic scholarship of Doctors Driver and Cheyne; in a fourth he sneers at the theories of learned Egyptologists (pp. 137, 162). Ordinary sense of humor would have saved him from much of the pretentious dogmatism and overweening vanity that spoil the soundness of his strongest arguments. His tone is that of a pedagogue lecturing refractory schoolboys. Human nature finds it difficult enough to bend its knee before an authority that claims Divine sanction for its utterances; it is likely only to laugh at, when it does not contemptuously reject, the right of a self-constituted judge to lay down the law on theological problems about which the learned theologian speaks with bated breath—the more so when that very judge denounces a teaching authority in matters of doctrine with no uncertain voice. "Let us [he writes in language that Martin Luther might have employed][1] be done with grand-theology. The dark ages are past and gone. We belong to an age of enlightenment. The twentieth century has dawned. No Protestant . . . should fear free thought. To fall back upon authority and traditional beliefs is sheer apostasy from the principles of the Reformation."[2]

On a par with Sir Robert Anderson's theological assurance is his assumption of spiritual superiority to his opponents. "It would be," he says, "the merest affectation in one who knows even a little of the

[1] P. 185. It is to be presumed that Sir R. Anderson adopts these sentiments which, he says, contain "a definite element of truth," adding that he is predisposed to respond to such appeals.

[2] P. 185, *cf.* p. 45; where he holds up to contempt the "Irish peasant who grovels before his priest and takes the law from his mouth."

spiritual meaning and 'hidden harmony' of Scripture, to pretend that he can study such works as Hasting's 'Bible Dictionary,' and 'The Encyclopædia Biblica,' without being conscious of living in a sphere which most of the writers seem to have never entered, and of the very existence of which they display no knowledge." (Pp. 252–3.)

It is possible that his charge of unspirituality may be true in the case of certain of the more advanced critics, but the author shows no sense of discrimination, condemning equally moderate and extreme Biblical scholars who disagree with his own limited views based on as limited knowledge. We must add that the assumption of spiritual discernment sits ill on one who displays such ill-natured spleen (mixed with the venom of the un-Christian un-charity that thinketh evil), as is visible in the following passage, characteristic of several others: "The critics represent that the scholarship of Christendom is with them. But the claim is absolutely unfounded. Their apparent preëminence is due largely to their being adepts in the art of what the Americans call 'literary log-rolling.' They are 'a mutual admiration society.' No one of them can raise a cry but that the whole party responds. And then the secular press joins in." (P. 255.)

But what are we to say of the religious feeling of a writer who can compare the critical methods of his opponents—in this case the authors of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*—to the immoralities of the Merry Monarch? We question whether the most unspiritual of the higher critics has shown such conspicuous bad taste as Sir R. Anderson in the following passage which, we are sorry to say, does not stand alone: "Without help from France, Charles II could not so easily have overcome what he deemed English prudery; and so here foreign critics have been called in to force the pace with their British brethren." (P. 38, *cf.* pp. 36–7; 69–70.)

When we turn to the book itself to see how far it vindicates its author's claim to scholarship, learning, and judicial power of weighing evidence,[3] we have to confess to an astonishment that gives place to indignation (akin to the author's own "amazement and indignation" on p. 131) at the slender equipment of a writer with so many pretensions to superior knowledge. It is one thing to say of his opponents that they "know nothing of the typology of Scripture" (p. 258, note),

[3] Dr. Moule in his preface speaks of the author's training "in a severe school of legal and judicial investigation," fitting him peculiarly "to sift witnesses and weigh evidence."

"are ignorant of the language in which Christian doctrine is taught in the New Testament," and to state broadly that the Higher Criticism is no criticism at all; it is quite another to prove the possession of the solid learning of a theological expert that alone warrants such unsupported statements. Sir Robert Anderson, indeed, maintains with a delightful air of unconsciousness that "every book (he has) written gives proof of fearlessness in bringing critical methods to bear upon the study of Scripture;" but the fact that the higher critics have for the most part passed over in silence these "decisive victories" over their most cherished conclusions is the best proof of their real value. Certainly, if they are of the same calibre as the present work, or the one on "Daniel in the Critics' Den," we are not surprised at the fate which they have received.[4] But why should we prolong our criticism? The author himself abdicates his claim to serious attention when he declares that "any Christian who has made a life-study of the Bible is as competent to form an opinion upon it as the ablest Hebraist in Christendom" (p. 50, *cf.* p. 96). He mistakes vehemence of invective for solidity of argument. His opponents might with better reason hurl back at him the accusation of "pompous pedantry combined with a special type of ignorance" (p. 215, *note*), which he uses so freely, on the strength of his unsupported *ipse dixit*, against those who differ from him ("credulous fools" he elsewhere politely calls them). His lack of judicial discrimination is fairly illustrated by his sweeping criticism of the Revised Version (pp. 104–110), (backed singularly enough by the great name of Dr. Moule's predecessor in the See of Durham, Dr. Westcott). "In many instances," he writes, "the Revisers' changes in the text are new errors." On a par with this is his fulsome laudation of Dr. Hatch's "Bampton Lectures" as "one of the greatest theological books of the age."

The treatment of inspiration is typical of the rest of the book. Sir Robert Anderson makes the theological student hold up his hands in despair when he defines verbal inspiration (the backbone of his thesis) in language so vague that anyone might accept it. "It is," he says, embodied in the statement that "the record as given by each [sacred writer] was guided and controlled by the Spirit of God" (p. 228, *cf.* p. 79). He goes on from this slender premise to argue that

[4] On the other hand Sir Robert Anderson intervened with some measure of success in the celebrated dispute in the *Times*, between Mr. Gladstone and Professor Huxley, on the subject of the Mosaic Cosmogony.

our Lord's promise concerning the guidance of the Holy Spirit settles the question of inspiration. He has not a word to say to the divers arguments of the higher critics on the authorship of the books of the New Testament, except for a passing unsupported statement that the Second Epistle of St. Peter was written by the Apostle. Dr. Gore's theory on more or less Catholic lines, that the Bible, including the New Testament, must be accepted in the last resort on the authority of the Church, is dismissed contemptuously in a few sentences (pp. 172 ff).

The author is on surer ground when he attacks trenchantly the Kenoticism associated with the name of the last-mentioned writer. Whether the inspired record be the Pentateuch, the books of Jonah and Daniel, or Kings, the dilemma is the same. Either Christ's testimony to the divine authorship, and consequent veracity of the books of the Old Testament, is true from the fact that He was Omniscient God, or He was the fallible "dupe of a current Jewish notion." "No straining [he adds with clinching force] of the doctrine of Kenosis will cover this" false guidance on a matter of primary religious importance; "it brings us within sight of the great anti-Christian apostasy of the latter days" (p. 74).[5]

Considerable dialectical skill is also shown in a further passage where the erstwhile "irrefragable" conclusions of Schleiermacher, Baur and Strauss are lightly put aside as an "episode" by Professor Harnack—a fate that augurs ill for the finality of modern advanced criticism. If all the book were written in a similar strain we should have little cause of quarrel with it. We gladly admit the lucidity and strength of the author's style (racy enough for the most superficial reader), and the frequent originality of his thought; but, as a whole, it makes us wonder that Bishop Moule should have given it the hall-mark of his name. It is true that his Lordship disclaims sympathy with the tone of certain passages and details in the subject-matter (p. v); but he does not hesitate to describe the volume as "an example of exactly the sort of work which the Church needs in an eminent degree" (p. vi). We wish we could share in the Bishop's optimism. It is just because we have at heart the same principles which Sir Robert Anderson holds perhaps in an exaggerated form, that we deplore their present uncritical and haphazard defence. If strong statements and violent personalities could do duty for solid arguments, the author would

[5] *Cf.* pp. 71–73, 175–176. 265.

have proved *ex abundanti cautela* his qualifications for his self-imposed task as the champion of orthodoxy. As it is, we greatly fear that his book is calculated to do more harm than good. It remains a melancholy witness to the impotence of amateur attacks on the impugners of the authority of Scripture from the non-Catholic camp. No one will question Sir R. Anderson's courage; most unbiassed readers will wish that it had been tempered with discretion and a more accurate scholarship.

RELIGION AS A CREDIBLE DOCTRINE. A Study of the Fundamental Difficulty. By W. H. Mallock. Pp. 287. London: Chapman & Hall. 1903. Price, 12s. net.

The "Fundamental Difficulty" which Mr. Mallock essays to meet is the *rationale* of free-will in the scheme of human things. In the pages of the London *Fortnightly Review*, a year ago, he criticised at great length the arguments of Father Maher, S.J., in his contribution to the Stonyhurst manuals of Catholic Philosophy on "Psychology" (a work that won for its author the degree of Doctor of Literature from the University of London, in spite of the fact that the examiner's own position was stoutly rebutted in it). The present elaborate volume is the outcome of those articles in an enlarged form. Besides meeting the fundamental difficulty of free-will, he attempts in it to buttress two other basal truths—the existence of a Personal God worthy of man's spiritual communion, and the continuance of human life after the body's death—which, together with it, constitute, he thinks, the essence of religion.

It will be necessary at this point, in order to make clear the subtle nature of his apologetic, to state what the book does *not* contain. In the first place, then, it is beyond its purpose to harmonize the doctrines of Revelation with the postulates of science. A main part of the book is taken up with an elaborate demonstration of the impossibility of defending Christianity by an appeal to apparently parallel truths in the scientific world. The author thinks that science and faith are poles asunder, denizens of separate kingdoms, on opposite sides of a wide, deep chasm, and that any attempt to bridge the intervening space is doomed to inevitable failure.

He modestly disclaims the intention of even settling what he regards as the rival claims of each champion, and pours abundant contempt on what he terms sarcastically "emotional apologetics." His office is merely that of a chartered accountant in the intellectual sphere who

casts up the items on either side, balances them, and gives the correct total. "What is wanted," he writes, "is an intellectual accountant, who will go carefully over the books of both the apologists of religion and the champions of science,"—not a *pseudo*-scientific theologian or an irreligious scientist.

Secondly, the book does not profess to be a detailed defence of the special doctrines of Christianity. Mr. Mallock is at pains to point out in more than one place (*cf.* especially the chapter on Free Will) that "the doctrines of religion which concern us . . . are not any doctrines which Christianity professes to reveal, but merely the doctrines which it, like other religions, presupposes"—*scil.*, the fundamental theses (familiar to students of Kant) of human freedom, of the existence of a Personal God, and of the continuous life of the soul after death. These three doctrines alone[1] make a "living religion possible," and it is the author's object to establish them on an impregnable basis.

How does he do so? His argument is twofold; the first part of the book is taken up with purely negative criticism, the second part is a brilliant constructive defence of Theism. Let us consider each line of thought separately.

We cannot do better than quote the summary which he gives of the conclusions of his negative criticism: "If," he writes, "we consider the universe apart from the organic life contained in it, it is . . . a system of absolute monism.[2] . . . We have also seen that . . . organic life is a system of absolute monism likewise, and that if in the cosmic process there has been any interference at any time, it was, to quote an expression of Professor Ward's, an 'interference that took place before the process began, not during it.' We have seen that, consequently, the entire intellectual system of religion —the doctrines of immortality, of freedom, and a God who is in relation to ourselves separable from this process—is not only a system which is unsupported by any single scientific fact, but is also a system for which among the facts of science it is utterly impossible for the intellect to find a place."

This is strong language, and it is difficult to see how a writer who uses it is other than a rationalist wolf wearing the fleece of a be-

[1] He terms them the "three essential dogmas" or "propositions" of religion.

[2] Monism as defined by Romanes is a form of idealism. It is the theory that "matter in motion is identical with mind." ("Mind, Matter, Monism.")

lieving sheep. He makes no secret of his intention to be "profoundly irritating" (to quote his own phrase) to those who attempt to make science the ally of faith. Respect for the weak brother is the last quality we would look for in him. He tears down ruthlessly the veils that apologists, from Bishop Butler to Father Maher, have industriously hung over the nakedness of Christian dogmas viewed from a scientific viewpoint. On the other hand, he shows an equal relish in lampooning the mistakes of eminent foes of Christianity. For he is no blind worshipper of great names. If he holds up Catholic theologians to ridicule, he accuses Mr. Herbert Spencer of "anthropomorphism with a vengeance," and criticises severely Professor Huxley's temporary forgetfulness of his own logical system of monistic Determinism in the interest of man's ethical dignity as analogous to "the antics of a barking dog in front of a locomotive engine." [3]

The two last-named philosophers are dragged later on at the wheels of Mr. Mallock's argument. From their fruitless attempts to invent an emotional substitute for Theism that will give an ethical sanction to man's conduct, he concludes that "belief in God and immortality is necessary to mental civilization." "How," he asks contemptuously, does Mr. H. Spencer's monistic conception of the universe "allow of our telling ourselves that the Universal Cause, of whose character we know nothing, would prefer that we did one necessary thing rather than another necessary thing, and that it is open to us to coöperate with the will of this mysterious gentleman?"

He next passes in review the idealistic school represented by Professor Ward, of Cambridge University, giving a particularly clear summary of the salient points of their teaching, with whose conclusions he shows evident sympathy, in spite of his criticism. Notwithstanding their efforts to distinguish between a "real world" without "existence" and an "existing world" without "reality" (surely, a nebulous theory in good sooth), he shows that they join hands with Determinists in denying Free Will. "As to his will [Mr. Mallock epitomizes the universal teaching of scientific philosophy as expounded by him], man is nothing but a mere machine [whose] life . . . [is] as a fleeting phenomenon which appears with the body and disappears with it, leaving nothing behind."

Or, as he expresses it elsewhere, "That entire conception of ex-

[3] He also pillories some of the arguments in the same work of Huxley's (*Evolution and Ethics*), remarking that the writer displays "a pitiable piece of card-sharping with words and ideas."

istence which alone, for the mass of mankind, has invested life with value, is in absolute opposition to that general system of the universe, the accuracy of which is every day re-attested by every fresh addition to our positive knowledge."

To this paradoxical statement he appends the very apposite question, "How is it possible to reconcile these two opposites?" His chapter on "The practical synthesis of contradictories"—one of the most remarkable in the book—affords an answer. It will repay a detailed examination if only for the reason that it gives us the key to Mr. Mallock's thought. It opens with the admission that from the fact that God is "incomprehensible," it follows that our ideas concerning Him contain manifest contradictions. But this is also true of other objects of knowledge. The prophets of Monism are guilty of manifold contradictions in their scientific system. As a crucial example we have the theory of ether, which has taken the place of that of bodies separated from each other by space. That discovery was thought at first to explain how one mass of matter can attract another mass, but it is now seen only to give rise to increasing perplexities. "The difficulties," says the author, "which inhere in the theistic conception of God, and those which inhere in the scientific conception of ether [*e. g.*, the expansion and contraction of a continuous body, the resolution of a simple body into a specific complexity], are for the mere intellect practically one and the same." On similar grounds it is shown that *all* scientific knowledge, when analyzed sufficiently, ends in paradoxes and incomprehensibility, yet for all practical purposes we accept the conclusions of science, ignoring the preliminary contradictions. "Nobody doubts the reality of time . . . because his intellect refuses to grasp the idea of eternity," nor the reality of space, because his intellect refuses to grasp the idea of infinity. The conclusion is thus stated: "If every synthesis which we make in picturing the world as real involves, when submitted to analysis, contradictions which cannot be reconciled, and if nevertheless our belief in the reality of the world continues, it is perfectly obvious that there can be no *a priori* reason why we should not believe in the reality of the religious synthesis, though the principle of freedom which it obliges us to assert appears to our intellect incompatible with the determinism which we are unable to deny." In fine, Mr. Mallock's position is based on an *argumentum ad hominem*. If we are compelled to "supplement our belief in science by other beliefs which contradict the first principles of science;" if as strong a 'fundamental difficulty' confronts the teaching of science and ethics

as religious dogma; then there is no intellectual necessity laid upon us of abandoning the primary doctrines of faith because they seem to involve us in unthinkable or even contradictory conclusions. As with science so with religion: "the intellectual compatibility of propositions is no test of their truth."[4] What is that test? In answering this question Mr. Mallock arrives at the second and constructive part of his argument.

His negative argument is not dissimilar to that originally framed by Bishop Butler, and modernized by Mr. A. J. Balfour in his "Foundations of Belief." It may be summed up in the phrase that logically there is no alternative between universal scepticism [*e. g.*, as regards the testing of science on the impenetrability of matter no less than that of theology or moral freedom] and Theism.

Not only, however, is religion not irrational; there are "weightiest and most definite reasons" for accepting it. These are supplied by Mr. Mallock under the title of "Practical Bases of Belief." He is here hardly so ingenious in dialectic or brilliant in exposition as in the first part of his book. Nevertheless, his argument is forcible and should appeal to the modern sceptical mind. Briefly, it is on the following lines: Religion bases its validity on its power to satisfy man's sorest and deepest needs. Defenders of Monism, like Huxley and Spencer,[5] as we have seen at an earlier period, show the weakness of their position by the shifts to which they are reduced in their sorry

[4] Towards the end of his treatise Mr. Mallock enunciates the same principle thus: "If religion, in the face of modern knowledge, is ever to be established on a firm intellectual basis, this result must be brought about by a recognition of the truth that the existence of nothing in its totality can ever be grasped by the intellect. . . . Let us only get rid of this utterly false idea that no two beliefs can be true which the intellect is unable to reconcile; and we shall then with equal confidence be able to accept both. We must learn with regard to the deeper things of life, that the fact of our adopting a creed which involves an assent to contradictories is not a sign that our creed is useless or absurd, but that the ultimate nature of things is for our minds inscrutable." It will be seen that the philosophical basis of the argument is substantially the same as that outlined by Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, and developed in his "Critique of Practical Reason."

[5] Mr. Mallock declares Mr. H. Spencer's Monism to be a practical "re-introduction of Theism, called by another name, and deprived of its logical coherency, so that it falls to pieces at a touch, like a watch without its screws." It should be noted that even the rationalist Hæckel admits in his *Glaubensbekentniss* that the morality of the Monistic Natural Creed "nowise contradicts the good and truly precious part of the Christian ethics." (*Cf.* his *Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft.*)

makeshifts for the Personal God, judging the immortal soul for its use of its moral freedom, of Theism. We think that Mr. Mallock might have shown conveniently at this point that the doctrine of Monism itself, when properly understood, leads to Theism. In the words of a recent writer in the *Fortnightly Review*: "Either one must believe the universe to be one and systematic, and held together by some omnipresent quality, or one must believe it to be a casual aggregation, an incoherent accumulation, with no unity whatsoever outside the unity of the personality regarding it. All science and most modern religious systems presuppose the former and to believe [it] is to anyone not anxious to quibble, to believe in God." (December, 1901, p. 1064.)

Religion, moreover, is beneficial to the race generally. Without its teaching, civilization based on right ethics, which, in their turn, involve the axioms of Theism, would be on the wane. "It is essential to, and implied in, the entire development and exercise of the higher faculties generally." In his concluding chapter on "The Reasonable Liberation of Belief" the author develops this line of thought by an appeal to universal experience in support of his contention that religious belief satisfies a deep-seated need of human nature, is supremely necessary for man's moral perfection as a member of society, and is as reasonable as our assent to "the reality of the cosmic world." On these grounds, therefore, first, because "no logical substitute for theism can be devised; secondly (because), the substitutes such as they are (the reference is to the philosophy of H. Spencer and Huxley) are no less inconsistent than theism is, with the universe as science reveals it to us; and thirdly (because), religion . . . claims its place as an element in life, not only (inasmuch as) it ministers to and interprets the special aspirations and emotions which we commonly call religion, . . . but also because it is essential to the development of the higher human faculties;" for these reasons Mr. Mallock concludes, we are justified in affirming the truth of the primary doctrines of religion, although we know that we cannot ourselves by any intellectual device reconcile them with the truths of science, which at the same time we accept also. Thus it is that he exhibits Theism as "a system worthy of general acceptance."

The treatise affords abundant food for thought. It should take its rank beside Mr. Balfour's "Foundations of Belief" as a luminous survey, from a severely intellectual standpoint, of the reasonableness of the basis of religion, well-calculated to make the captious sceptic pause and to allay the fears of the honest doubter.

Our chief complaint against it is its wanton iconoclasm. Mr. Mallock positively revels in paradox; he pulls down with one hand what he essays to build up with the other. Especially in his remarks on free-will (which form the nucleus of his work) he makes no disguise of his contempt for every argument in its favor. For ourselves we confess that he appears to us to take shelter behind ridicule instead of meeting squarely in the open the late Dr. W. G. Ward's assault on Determinism—an assault which so doughty a champion as John Stuart Mill declared to be the most serious made. He has really no satisfactory answer to make to Dr. Ward's appeal to the universal experience of the possession of the power of choice in the moment of mental decision. He contents himself with the cheap sneer that Dr. Ward attempting to meet the objections of the Determinist school, is like someone "running from a train which, before he has gone a yard, overtakes him and knocks him down." We miss in the book the cautiousness, the restraint, the moderation, the scrupulous fairness towards opponents, that were such marked characteristics of Mr. Balfour's monumental work. It will be impossible to find in the pages of the latter such levity of tone and irresponsibility of statement as occur on pp. 115, 140, 141 of the present book. It may please Mr. Mallock's wit to include beer and mutton chops in his larder of metaphor; it certainly does not enhance the seriousness and weight of his arguments. We regret these lapses from good taste the more because they are calculated to give the impression that the author is a *dilettante*, a trifler, a chopper of logic, taking only an academic interest in his subject. The book contains so much thoughtful matter, so many shrewd thrusts at fallacies of the market-place, so subtle a defence of the fundamental postulates of Theism, that we wish it a better fate than we fear its blemishes will allow it to receive. W. R. C.

EPISTOLAE ET EVANGELIA Totius Anni Secundum Missale Romanum S. Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Cum Approbatione S. Rituum Congregationis. Editio Tertia. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit Congreg. Typographi. 1903. Pp. 236—76—16.

For the solemn services in our cathedrals and parish churches this handsome volume supplies a most desirable adjunct. Instead of the heavy missal from which the deacon and subdeacon are ordinarily obliged to chant the Gospel and Epistle at Solemn Mass, we have here

a slender volume, beautifully printed and tastefully bound, which the sacred minister can hold without being fatigued and which renders easy the opening and graceful carrying about of the same during the functions. The collection has all the Epistles and Gospels belonging to the latest revision of the missal, and includes the *Propria* for the United States and South America.

THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY. By Edwin R. A. Seligman, Professor of Political Economy and Finance, Columbia University, New York. New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Company, Agents. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 166.

THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL MOTION. By Michael A. Lane. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 577.

The thesis formulated and defended by Professor Seligman runs thus: Since man's existence depends on his ability to sustain himself, the economic life is the fundamental condition of all life. Human life being, however, normally social, individual existence moves within the framework of the social structure and is modified by it. What the conditions of maintenance are to the individual, the similar relations of production and consumption are to the community. To economic causes, therefore, must be traced in last instance those transformations in the structure of society which themselves condition the relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life. The doctrine herein summarized has been sometimes called "historical materialism," or the "materialistic interpretation of history." "Economic determinism" is also one of its titles. In so far, however, as these appellations are meant to be exclusive of all moral and consequently free agencies working in the development of social institutions, they are inexact and misleading. The economic interpretation of history is preferred by the author as indicating that economic activity has been the preponderating factor in shaping and developing all human society.

The theory is, of course, not a new one. Traces of it may be found as far back as the middle of the seventeenth century; for does not Harrington observe in his *Oceana*, "such as is the proportion or balance of dominion or property in Land, such is the nature of the Empire"? In its more fully recognized content and bearings, however, its promulgation must be attributed to Marx. In the third volume of *Das Kapital*

he writes: "It is always the immediate relation of the owner of the conditions of production to the immediate producers . . . in which we find the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and thus also of the political forms." One does not commit oneself to the idealistico-materialistic philosophy of Marx, much less to his socialistic doctrines, when one accords to the author of *Das Kapital* the credit of seeing more deeply than had his predecessors into the influence of economic forces in the progress of history.

Professor Seligman, in the present small volume, made up, by the way, of articles which he had contributed to the *Political Science Quarterly*, traces the history of the theory, and replies to the criticism that has been brought against it. The latter portion of the work is especially interesting and satisfying,—not least for the calm, conservative temper of the discussion. Though the defence is firm and urgent, there is a prevailing sense of moderation as well as avoidance on the whole of an exaggerated extension of the theory, to the exclusion of the moral and spiritual influences that have produced and developed social and political institutions.

There are, however, some opinions of the author with which the Catholic reader finds himself at variance; for instance, this: that the conception of crimes and torts—offences against society and indviduals—preceded the conception of sin, or offence against God or the moral law, reflected in conscience. The oldest and most reliable truly historical record that we possess, to say nothing of the universal traditions of the race, points to an offence against the Deity as the first sin. On philosophical grounds moreover—psychological and ethical—we must express dissent from the following: "The reason why it is not safe, categorically, to deny the existenc of morality among animals is that the older contention of an essential psychical difference between man and animals has broken down before the flood of recent investigation. Coöperative biology has proved that psychological phenomena begin far down in animal life. Some writers profess to find them among the very lowest classes of beings, so low, indeed, that it is even doubtful whether they belong to the animal or to the vegetable kingdom" (p. 114).

This we must characterize as a perfectly gratuitous assertion. There is not the slightest evidence for this "flood of recent investigation that has broken down the older contention of an essential psychical difference between man and animals;" on the contrary, the whole flood of recent investigation moves in the opposite direction and confirms the older contention. Coöperative biology has *proved*, we prefer to say, what observation reveals, viz., that psychological phenomena of a *lower degree* began far down in animal life, in the amœba, the monera. On the other hand, the psychological phenomena of the *highest degree*,

manifested in the abstractive and reflective processes of intellect and the elective power of will, are man's specific endowments which he shares with no being of the purely animal kingdom.

On the whole, what we find commendable in the book is its presentation of the proximate reasons for the thesis. When the argument moves on philosophical grounds it displays the gratuitousness and the weakness inherent in materialistic evolutionism.

In the *Level of Social Motion* Mr. Lane maintains a thesis substantially identical with that defended by Professor Seligman. Whilst the latter, however, interprets the past in the light of his theory, the former is more concerned with the future. The one is historical, the other prophetic. The cosmical and biological forces, of which the economic are supposed to be but a specialized form, are gradually but certainly carrying the human race onward to a state of equilibrium in which the sum of social product will be equally divided among those who produce it. The general diffusion of wealth and education will, moreover, result in a permanent equalization of population. The author brings some acute observations from experience, economics and biology to bear on his conclusions, but they are so overgrown by exaggerated statements and unwarranted influences and so entangled in a radically erroneous psychology that their effectiveness is practically choked. A few citations will suffice to introduce the reader to the author's psychology. "The subject-matter of psychology," he says, "is the brain and the nerves with their functions" (p. 424). Operations within the brain itself take place by means of certain movements among the ganglion cells, and this process is called intellection (*ib.*). "Psycho-physicists work on the assumption that all the obscure phenomena of mind could be explained if the cellular action of the brain were once completely understood. Many of the simpler operations of thought are equally accounted for in this way; and many of the more complex phenomena of the mind are found, upon closer examination, to be due altogether to the same cause. Consciousness itself is held to be only the sum of ganglion action, and while this view is not the popular one, nobody has been able to aduce a single fact in its contradiction" (p. 425). Further on we are told that "experiment has proved that thought is nothing but nervous action highly compounded," and "that mental action, like physical or vital action, is purely mechanical." What most strongly impresses the reader is the ease with which scientific and philosophical problems that theretofore have baffled the deepest minds are solved in these pages. Thus he finds that whilst "we do not know the nature of nervous force—it is none the less true that we *do* know the method by which nervous force acts; and in that method there is no mystery at all." Once more, "the uncultured person sees mystery in the phenomena of his own consciousness simply because he does not understand the action going on in his brain. He knows nothing of cellular physiology or of ganglion structure—" (p. 429). The author's self-confidence is truly colossal.

Literary Chat.

Few literary projects have been undertaken of late years which promise to equal in thoroughness the announced publication of the *History of the Philippine Islands* by the Clark Company (Cleveland, O.). The available material, which has been carefully gone over by the principal editors, Professor James Alexander Robertson and Miss Emma H. Blair (of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin), embraces an immense store of manuscripts, charts, and designs, including valuable documents from the archives of Madrid, Simaucas, Seville, mostly hitherto unpublished; these have been collated with originals in other national libraries. It is conjectured that the work will be completed in fifty-five volumes, to be issued by subscription, the number of copies to be limited to a thousand sets.

The Clergy will be glad to be reminded that the Ratisbon firm of Fr. Pustet has published four excellent manuals containing separately the Offices of the Passion of Holy Week (from Palm Sunday until Whit Sunday), of Pentecost week, and of Corpus Christi with the Office of the Sacred Heart. These little volumes, which have also the Mass service for each of the seasons of the respective feasts, are beautifully printed and neatly bound in flexible covers, to suit their special purpose as serving as a handy synopsis of the Breviary during festive seasons.

The *American College* at Louvain (Belgium) is making spirited progress not only in matters of cultivating the missionary zeal which has been transmitted to its students as a sacred trust by a noble band of priestly models, but also in developing a zest for literary activity. The first number of the Louvain *American College Bulletin* tells how the magazine originated in the desire to create a continuous and tangible bond between the alumni in all parts of the United States, and the Alma Mater with its corps of levites still in training. The old students will thus be kept informed of the progress of their College, and the publication will serve as a fitting reminder of the high aims which the members of an institution, destined to fashion heroic souls, are bound to maintain by their allegiance to the principles of its foundation. The opportunities offered to American students who go to European colleges, however great from the viewpoint of special intellectual culture, are not necessarily an advantage to the young priest. Study may beget nothing more than knowledge accompanied by a sense of self-sufficiency which ends in inactivity at an age wherein the best work of a well informed man shou'd be done for others. To make foreign culture of real service for the student of theology or letters there must be fostered with it the spirit of practical utility, the habit of looking upon study as instrumental to the further acquisition and extension of the Kingdom of Christ, the spirit of generous coöperation in any work that makes for the popularizing of truth and charity. This practical view has, it seems to us, been the spirit characteristic of the College at Louvain. It speaks out of the activity of many of the men trained there during the last decades, who in every part of the United States are given to arduous labor, missionary and intellectual, in spheres which suggest little prospect of cultured ease or preferment. There must be upwards of four hundred priests on our missions who have been trained in the American College at Louvain, most of them in the West and Southwest, having the care of widely scattered congregations. To these a monthly word from their Alma Mater through a publication like the *Bulletin*

will prove an added measure of strength and joy; and it is likely to produce a still ampler growth of men who, to ability and love for the mission work, join a taste for reading and study by which they fill out profitably their hours of temporary rest from pastoral labor. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has been, we understand, a favorite at the Belgian College, and, indeed, with the Louvain priests generally, from its beginning. Hence we feel a kind of family interest in the success of the Bulletin.

There is unusual activity of late in our Catholic educational field. We are getting pedagogical literature from the Catholic point of view. Since the efforts made to extend and perpetuate the Public-School system, which eliminates all definite religious teaching from the curriculum, have warned us that we are soon to face an agnostic or atheistic condition of national society, attempts have been made to give teachers a periodical representing Catholic principles of education. The late Mr. Montgomery, an ardent champion of religious education and of the right of parents to secure it for their children, undertook to maintain, single-handed, a monthly, with the title of "Family Defender." Its attitude was, in the main, polemical. It proposed to inaugurate and keep alive, until victory were attained, a continuous warfare against the policy of irreligious State schools supported by common taxation without adequate representation of the parents. It maintained that, if one-third of the population which was taxed to provide a common education for the children of the land were dissatisfied with the education imparted, they had a right to have a remedy applied which was just to all. It proved that a fair division of the taxes for this purpose was quite as feasible as a system of local option in other spheres of municipal or State rule. Mr. Montgomery showed not only that the public system, as carried on, implied a flagrant violation of the parental right, but he also pointed out other defects resulting from our State patronage in education. Catholics clapped their hands at Mr. Montgomery's courage, but they waited to see whether he would win without other active coöperation. Thus he failed; and his enterprise remains a monument to his nobility of character, and to the supineness of his fellows.

But Catholics continued to have evidence that if they would secure proper education for the next generation they must build their own schools wherever possible. Rome urged the matter, and under a unified discipline Parochial Schools were built in all parts of the country. With the growth of the Parochial Schools, and a greater attention to method in the Sunday-school in places where a parish school was impracticable for the time being, further efforts were made to supply literary help in monthly publications, among which may be mentioned as entirely devoted to the subject, *The School Journal*, published by the late Rector of our Catholic University, then a parish priest in New England. The most notable effort in this direction, however, came with the establishment of the Summer School, and *Mosher's Magazine* as a special organ for our Catholic teachers. Mr. Mosher made a valiant struggle, and there is no doubt that his work, like that of Mr. Montgomery, will be better appreciated some future day, when it will be more evident that he paved the way for others who will follow with more apparent success in the same difficult field.

But *Mosher's Magazine* has recently left the narrow path of a strictly pedagogical medium, and turned into the wider path of general Catholic literature, though

not without retaining a decided partiality for its former scope and work. In the meantime the Northwest has become alive to the needs of the hour, and as a result *The Catholic School Journal* issued not long ago from Milwaukee. It shows in all its numbers a lively attention to current educational topics, is full of interesting opinions from experienced teachers, and seeks apparently to minister to the popular element among Catholic educators.

If *The Catholic School Journal* falls in any sense short in dealing with the graver problems of education, the demand is likely to be supplied by the most recent champion of Catholic education, *The Review of Catholic Pedagogy*, issued from Chicago. We are averse to praising an enterprise such as this before it has approved itself, but we are free to say that the first two numbers give one an excellent impression of the new magazine's purpose and ability. The form too in which it offers itself to Catholic teachers is respectable and in line with the advance made in this direction by our religious magazines generally of late years. Catholic publicists who are in quest of revenue by ministering to the religious needs of their fellows, are apt to neglect the finer sense of making externals harmonize with the high purpose of spiritual teaching; and as a consequence the estimate of Catholic literature itself has been lowered, so that persons of taste look upon any work which bears the trade-mark of religion with suspicion. *The Review of Catholic Pedagogy* is as well printed and furnished as it is edited, and gives good promise of its growth and efficiency.

By a happy coincidence the *Mangalore* (*India*) *Magazine*, commenting upon Dr. Henry's version of the Holy Father's poems published by us, selects the stanza which the translator has taken for his keynote of the beautiful Jubilee expression appearing in the present issue of THE DOLPHIN, and remarks that these lines "have often been translated, but perhaps never so felicitously."

We may borrow from the March DOLPHIN'S illuminated frontispiece on the occasion of the Papal Jubilee the following elegant lines, suggested to their author by the portrait of the Holy Father;

"Sun-wrought with magic of the skies,
The image fair before me lies:
Deep-vaulted brow and sparkling eyes
And lip's fine chiseling.

"Yet have the Years of Peter caught
A subtler art, a grander thought,
And in thy face the glory wrought
Of Father and of King."

The Leader is the new name given to *The Young Catholic* published by the Paulist Fathers for young people. The magazine will be issued monthly instead of fortnightly as hitherto.

The article on *The Father's Right to Educate*, appearing in the current issue of THE DOLPHIN, deserves to be widely read for its solid and clearly developed doctrine. We need hardly recall the fact that the writer of it, Father William Humphrey, S.J., is the author of numerous works, among which will be best remembered, aside of his famous digest of Suarez' work on the Religious State, the volumes entitled "The Divine Teacher" and "The One Mediator."

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

EPISTOLAE ET EVANGELIA totius anni secundum Missale Romanum S. Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Cum Approbatione S. Rituum Congregationis. Editio Tertia. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumpt. et Typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rituum Congreg. Typographi. 1903. Pp. 328. Price, $10.80. Red morocco, richly gilt.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS FUNDAMENTALIS. Auctore Thoma Jos. Bouquillon, S.T.D., et in universitate Catholica Americana Theologiae moralis Professore. Editio recognita et adaucta. Brugis, Car. Beyaert, Editor. 1903. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet. Pp. 743. Pretium, $3.25 *net.*

OFFICIA PROPRIA MYSTERIORUM ET INSTRUMENTORUM PASSIONIS D. N. J. C. Juxta Breviarium Romanum. Cum Psalmis et Precibus in Extenso. Cum Approbatione Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis. Ratisbonae, Romae et Neo-Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. MDCCCIC. Pp. 156. Pretium, $0.75 *net.*

OFFICIUM IN FESTO PENTECOSTES et per totam Octavam, secundum Missale et Breviarium Romanum. Ratisbonae, Romae et Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. MCMI. Pp. 112. Pretium, $0.65 *net.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. Comprising each scene from the Washing of the Disciples' Feet to the Death upon the Cross. Part I. By the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. London and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1903. Pp. ix—219. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THEOLOGIA, or the Doctrine of God. Outline Notes Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, etc. Chicago, Toronto, New York: Fleming R. Revell & Co. 1903. Pp. viii—143. Price, $0.75 *net.*

HAPPINESS. Essays on the Meaning of Life. By Carl Hilty, Professor of Constitutional Law, University of Bern. Translated by Francis Greenwood Peabody, Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University, Cambridge. New York: Macmillan and Company; London: The Macmillan Company, Ltd. 1903. Pp. x—154. Price, $1.25 *net.*

EVANGELIUM DER BARMHERZIGKEIT. Fastenpredigten von P. Melchior Lechner, O. Fr. M., Lect. theol. Innsbruck: Felician Rauch. 1903. (New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.) Pp. 88 broch. Price, 25 cents.

WER IST CHRISTUS? Sechs Fastenpredigten von P. Melchior Lechner, O. Fr. M., Lect. theol. Innsbruck: Felician Rauch. 1903. (New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.) Pp. 103 broch. Price, 25 cents.

HAIL! FULL OF GRACE. Simple Thoughts on the Rosary. By Mother Mary Loyola. Edited by Father Thurston, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. xiii—261. Price, $1.35 *net.*

BEYOND THE GRAVE. From the French of Rev. E. Hamon, S.J. By Anna T. Sadlier. Second Edition. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. viii—300. Price, $1.00 *net.*

IN HOLIEST TROTH. The Story of St. Encratida, one of the Martyrs of Saragossa, A. D. 304. By Sister Mary Fidelis, author of *Growth in the Knowledge of Our Lord*, etc. London: Burns & Oates (New York: Benziger Brothers). 1902. Pp. 208.

THE ART OF LIFE. An Essay. By Frederic Charles Kolbe, D.D., of St. Mary's, Capetown. The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. (Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.) New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 109. Price, 75 cents.

HISTORY.

ROME AND REFORM. By T. L. Kington Oliphant, of Balliol College. In two volumes. London: Macmillan & Co. (New York: The Macmillan Company.). 1902. Pp. 541 and 548. Price, $7.00 *net.*

THE TRUTH OF PAPAL CLAIMS. By Raphael Merry Del Val, D.D., Archbishop of Nicæa. A Reply to the Validity of Papal Claims by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, D.D., English Chaplain in Rome. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1902. Pp. xvi—129—xv. Price, $1.00 *net.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY in Maryland and Rhode Island. By Rev. Lucian Johnson. Brooklyn and New York: International Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 56.

THE DISCOVERIES OF THE NORSEMEN IN AMERICA. With special relation to their early ethnographical representation. By Joseph Fischer, S.J., Professor of Geography, Jesuit College, Feldkirch. Translated from the German by Basil H. Soulsby, B.A. British Museum. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. (London: Henry Stevens, Son & Stiles.) 1903. Pp. 131. Illustrations and Maps. Price, $2.00.

BELLES-LETTRES.

TENNYSON'S GARETH AND LYNETTE, LANCELOT AND ELAINE, AND THE PASSING OF ARTHUR. Edited with Notes and Introduction by Sophie Chantal Hart, M.A., Associate Professor of Rhetoric in Wellesley College. New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxxii—127. Price, $0.50.

IRVING'S OLIVER GOLDSMITH. Edited with Notes and an Introduction by Lewis B. Semple, Ph.D., Teacher of English in the Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxiii—296. Price, $0.50.

THE ROSE AND THE SHEEPSKIN. By Joseph Gordian Daley, author of *A Cassock of the Pines.* New York: Wm. H. Young and Co. 1902. Pp. vi—389. Price, $1.00.

THE ART OF DISAPPEARING. By John Talbot Smith, author of *Saranac, His Honor the Mayor*, etc. New York City: William H. Young and Co. 1902. Pp. iv—367. Price, $1.50.

SIR WALTER SCOTT'S THE LADY OF THE LAKE. Edited with Notes and an Introduction by George Rice Carpenter, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia University. New York, London, Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv—191.

A ROYAL SON AND MOTHER. By the Baroness Pauline von Hügel. Notre Dame, Indiana: *The Ave Maria.* Loretto Press. Pp. 127. Price, $0.75.

THE TALISMAN. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 186. Price, $0.60.

THE PILKINGTON HEIR. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 212. Price, $1.25.

MISCELLANEOUS.

GENERAL VERSAMMLUNG (Sieben und Vierzigste) des Deutschen R. Katholischen Central-Vereins der Ver. Staaten von Nord Amerika, abgehalten in Evansville, Ind., 21 25 Sept., 1902. Milwaukee, Wis.: Excelsior Publishing Company. 1902. Pp. 184.

LE CANADA ECCLESIASTIQUE. Almanach Annuaire du Clergé Canadien. Publié par La Cie Cadieux et Derome. Pour l'année 1903. (17me.) Librairie Saint Joseph, 1666 Rue Notre Dame, Montreal. Pp. 334.

OFFICIAL CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, ALMANAC AND CLERGY LIST, for the year of our Lord 1903. Containing complete reports of all Dioceses in the United States, Canada, Newfoundland, Great Britain and Ireland, etc. Vol. XVIII. No. 1. Milwaukee, Wis.: The M. H. Wiltzius Company. Pp. 888–180–207. Price, $1.25.